

Sequential Fair Allocation: Achieving the Optimal Envy-Efficiency Tradeoff Curve

Sean R. Sinclair Siddhartha Banerjee Christina Lee Yu
School of Operations Research and Information Engineering
Cornell University

Abstract

We consider the problem of dividing limited resources to individuals arriving over T rounds. Each round has a random number of individuals arrive, and individuals can be characterized by their type (i.e. preferences over the different resources). A standard notion of ‘fairness’ in this setting is that an allocation simultaneously satisfy envy-freeness and efficiency. The former is an individual guarantee, requiring that each agent prefers her own allocation over the allocation of any other; in contrast, efficiency is a global property, requiring that the allocations clear the available resources. For divisible resources, when the number of individuals of each type are known upfront, the above desiderata are simultaneously achievable for a large class of utility functions. However, in an online setting when the number of individuals of each type are only revealed round by round, no policy can guarantee these desiderata simultaneously, and hence the best one can do is to try and allocate so as to approximately satisfy the two properties.

We show that in the online setting, the two desired properties (envy-freeness and efficiency) are in direct contention, in that any algorithm achieving additive envy-freeness up to a factor of L_T necessarily suffers an efficiency loss of at least $1/L_T$. We complement this uncertainty principle with a simple algorithm, GUARDED-HOPE, which allocates resources based on an adaptive threshold policy. We show that our algorithm is able to achieve any fairness-efficiency point on this frontier, and moreover, in simulation results, provides allocations close to the optimal fair solution in hindsight. This motivates its use in practical applications, as the algorithm is able to adapt to any desired fairness efficiency trade-off.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Overview of our Contributions	4
1.2	Other Motivating Examples	5
1.3	Outline of Paper	6
2	Related Work	6
3	Preliminaries	7
3.1	Model and Assumptions	7
3.2	Fairness and Efficiency in Offline Allocations	8
3.3	Approximate Fairness and Efficiency in Online Allocations	10
4	Uncertainty Principles	11
5	Concentration on Counterfactual Optimal Fair Allocation in Hindsight	14
6	Guarded-Hope	17
7	Envy and Efficiency Bound for Guarded-Hope	18
8	Numerical Results	22
8.1	Background	23
8.2	Simulation Results	24
9	Conclusion	27
A	Table of Notation	32
B	Discussion on Varian’s Fairness	33
B.1	Limitation of Fair Allocations	33
B.2	Competitive Ratio or Individual Guarantees	34
C	Experiment Details	34
D	Omitted Proofs	35

1 Introduction

Our work here is motivated by a problem faced by a collaborating food-bank (Food Bank for the Southern Tier of New York (FBST) [24]) in operating their mobile food pantry program. Recent demands for food assistance have climbed at an enormous rate, and an estimated fourteen million children are not getting enough food due to the COVID-19 epidemic in the United States [31, 12]. With sanctions on operating in-person stores, many foodbanks have increased their mobile food pantry services. In these systems, the mobile food-bank must decide on how much food to allocate to a distribution center on arrival, without knowledge of demands in future locations. This model also extends as a representation of broader stockpile allocation problems (such as vaccine and medical supply allocation) and reservation mechanisms.

As a simplified example (see Section 3 for the full model), every day, the mobile food pantry uses a truck to deliver B units of food supplies to individuals over T rounds (where each round can be thought of as a distribution location: soup kitchens, pantries, nursing homes, etc). When the truck arrives at a site t (or round t), the operator observes N_t individuals and chooses how much to allocate to each individual ($X_t \in \mathbb{R}^{N_t}$) before moving to the next round. The number of people assembling at each site changes from day to day, and the operator typically does not know the number of individuals at later sites (but has a sense of the distribution based on previous visits).

In *offline* problems, where the number of individuals at each round $(N_t)_{t \in [T]}$ are known to the principal in advance, there are many well-studied notions of fair allocations of resources. One individual guarantee, envy-freeness, requires that each individual prefers their own allocation over the allocation of any other. In contrast, efficiency is a global property, requiring that the allocations clear the available resources. For divisible resources, the above desiderata are simultaneously achievable for a large class of utility functions, with multiple resources, and is easily computed (via a convex program) by maximizing the Nash Social Welfare (NSW) objective subject to allocation constraints [46, 21]. As an example, in this (simplified) setting, the fair allocation is easily computed by allocating $X^{opt} = \frac{B}{N}$ to each individual, where $N = \sum_{t \in [T]} N_t$ is the total number of people across all rounds. This allocation is clearly envy-free (as each individual receives an equal allocation), and is efficient (as all of the resources are exhausted); its also easy to see that this is the *only* allocation that satisfies these two properties simultaneously.

Many practical settings, however, operate more akin to the FBST mobile food pantry, where the principal makes allocation decisions *online* with incomplete knowledge of the demand for future locations. However, these principals do have access to historical data allowing them to generate histograms over the number of individuals for each round (or potentially just first moment information like the expected number of individuals arriving to each round $\mathbb{E}[N_t]$). Designing good allocation algorithms in such settings necessitates harnessing the (Bayesian) information of future demands to ensure equitable access to the resource, while also adapting to the online realization of demands as they unfold to ensure efficiency.

Satisfying exactly one of these properties is trivially achievable in online settings. The solution that allocates $X_t = 0$ to each individual at location t satisfies envy-freeness as each individual is given an equal allocation. The solution that allocates $X_1 = B/N_1$ to individuals at location 1 and $X_t = 0$ for $t \geq 2$ satisfies efficiency as the entire budget is exhausted at the first location. The more important challenge in this setting, then, is defining meaningful notions of *approximately-fair online allocations*, and developing algorithms which are able to utilize distributional knowledge to achieve allocations that strike a balance between the competing objectives of envy-freeness and efficiency.




Figure 1: Graphical representation of the major contribution (Informal Theorem 1). Here, the x -axis denotes Δ_{EF} , the maximum difference between utility individuals receive from the algorithm and the fair allocation in hindsight, and the y -axis denotes $\Delta_{efficiency}$, the remaining resources. The dotted line represents the impossibility due to statistical uncertainty in the optimal allocation, and the region below the line represents the impossibility due to the envy-efficiency uncertainty principle.

1.1 Overview of our Contributions

In sequential settings, one way to measure the (*un*) *fairness* of any *online* allocation (X^{alg}) is in terms of its counterfactual distance (for both envy and efficiency) when compared to the *optimal fair allocation in hindsight* (i.e., *offline* allocation X^{opt}). In particular, we define the *counterfactual envy* as $\Delta_{EF} = \|u(X_{\theta}^{opt}, \theta) - u(X_{\theta}^{alg}, \theta)\|_{\infty}$ be the maximum difference in utility between the algorithm’s allocation and the offline allocation where agents are characterized by their type θ , and let $\Delta_{efficiency} = B - \sum_t N_t X_t^{alg}$ be the algorithm’s total leftover resources. These are both very stringent metrics, akin to the notion of regret in online decision-making settings, which subsume many other objectives. Minimizing some combination of Δ_{EF} and $\Delta_{efficiency}$ can be formulated as a Markov decision process (MDP); however, as these metrics depend on the entire allocation, the complexity of finding the optimal policy is exponential in the number of rounds, and also, may be difficult to interpret. Moreover, it is much harder to use MDP formulations to explore the tradeoff between the two objectives.

Our main technical contribution is to provide a complete characterization of the achievable pairs of $(\Delta_{EF}, \Delta_{efficiency})$ in expectation and with high probability under a wide range of online allocation settings, including multiple divisible resources, finite types, and linear utilities. In particular, we show the following informal theorem (see Fig. 1 for a graphical representation)

Informal Theorem 1 (See Theorems 4.1, 4.2 and 7.1 for full versions). *Under mild regularity conditions on the distribution of N_t , i.e. bounded mean and variance, we have the following (where \gtrsim ignores problem dependent constants and logarithmic factors of T):*

1. (Statistical Uncertainty Principle): *Any online allocation algorithm must suffer an envy of at least $\Delta_{EF} \gtrsim \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}$ due to the uncertainty of the number of individuals arriving at each location.*
2. (Envy-Efficiency Uncertainty Principle): *Any online allocation algorithm necessarily suffers*

$$\Delta_{\text{efficiency}} \Delta_{EF} \gtrsim 1.$$

3. (Upper Bound via GUARDED-HOPE): For any choice of $L_T \gtrsim \sqrt{\log(T/\delta)/T}$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, GUARDED-HOPE with parameter L_T achieves $\Delta_{EF} \lesssim L_T$ and $\Delta_{\text{efficiency}} \lesssim 1/L_T$.

In short, our results show that envy and waste must be inversely proportional to one another such that decreasing the envy requires increasing the waste and vice versa. Furthermore, we provide a simple algorithm, GUARDED-HOPE, which achieves the correct trade-off between envy and waste, matching the lower bound in terms of T up to logarithmic factors. Given an input of L_T for any $L_T \gtrsim \sqrt{\log(T/\delta)/T}$, our algorithm satisfies an envy bound of $\Delta_{EF} \lesssim L_T$ with waste bounded by $\Delta_{\text{efficiency}} \lesssim 1/L_T$ with probability $1 - \delta$.

To get some intuition into the envy-efficiency uncertainty principle, consider the simple food bank example described above (with arrivals N_t in each location, and $X^{\text{opt}} = B/N$ where $N = \sum_{t \in [T]} N_t$). For convenience we temporarily assume that each agents utility is directly proportional to their allocation (i.e. $u(X, \theta) = X$). Consider allocation X_1 at the first location: via standard concentration arguments, one can find high probability confidence bounds for B/N with a half-width on the order of $1/\sqrt{T}$. Now its not hard to argue that allocating according to the lower confidence bound at *all* locations, achieves $\Delta_{EF} \approx 1/\sqrt{T}$ and $\Delta_{\text{efficiency}} \approx \sqrt{T}$. This corresponds to the cusp of the efficiency-envy trade-off curve in Fig. 1.

Now if we relax the Δ_{EF} constraint to $\Delta_{EF} \approx 1/T^{1/3}$ and use the naive static policy of always allocating via the lower confidence bound, we get a waste of $T \cdot T^{-1/3} = T^{2/3}$. In contrast, for the same loss in envy-freeness, GUARDED-HOPE achieves $\Delta_{EF} \approx T^{1/3}$, which furthermore is the best possible. Moreover, we complement our theoretical results with experiments highlighting the empirical performance of different algorithms (both on sythetic settings, as well as a dataset based on mobile food pantry operations), which shows that even when the scaling behavior is the same, GUARDED-HOPE has much lower waste and envy compared to static under-allocation, as well as other natural heuristics.

While fairness in resource allocation is well-studied in offline and adversarial settings, fairness metrics for the sequential stochastic setting are poorly understood (especially when individuals are arriving online). Our proposed metrics and results give a novel way of extending Varian’s definitions of fairness to the sequential setting. Most existing work aims to show competitive ratio or additive guarantees on the Nash social welfare objective [9] or focus on the max-min objective [32, 34]. Such guarantees are dangerously misleading in that the resultant allocations may exhibit clear unfairness in hindsight. Similarly, an *ex ante* or probabilistic guarantee may also be perceived as unfair – both allocating 1 unit with certainty, and allocating 10 units with probability 1/10, give the same *ex ante* guarantee. In contrast, our chosen metrics and theoretical results provides a firm basis for *counterfactual and ex-post individual fairness guarantees*. While we do not believe our work gives a final answer in the theoretical and practical understanding of fairness in online allocation, we hope it will add to the conversation of incorporating ethics into sequential AI algorithms. More discussion on the advantages and disadvantages of our proposed fairness metrics is in Appendix B.

1.2 Other Motivating Examples

In addition to the mobile food pantry allocation problem which forms the focus of our work, we believe our ideas can prove useful in several other settings:

Stockpile Allocation. In many healthcare systems or resource allocation problems, government mechanisms decide how to allocate critical resources to states, individuals, or hospitals. For example, the US federal government was tasked with distributing Remdesivir, an antiviral drug used

early in the pandemic for COVID-19 treatment [33]. More recently a propos, states and government organizations have been deciding how to allocate COVID-19 (or influenza) vaccines to various population demographics across several rounds [50, 28]. In these scenarios on a monthly basis, each state is given a fixed amount of the resource (say COVID-19 vaccinations) and is tasked with distributing these to individuals across various distribution locations. While the primary goal is to develop efficient allocations (remarking the popularized term of getting “shots in arms”), an alternative objective may be to ensure equitable access to the resource [43, 20, 34].

Reservation Mechanisms. These are key for operating shared high-performance computing (HPC) systems [26]. Cluster centers for HPC receive numerous requests online with varying demands for CPUs and GPUs. Algorithms must allocate resources to incoming jobs with only distributional knowledge of future resource demands. Important to these settings is the large number of resources (number of GPUs, RAM, etc available at the center), requiring algorithms that scale to higher-dimensional problems.

1.3 Outline of Paper

The model and assumptions are introduced in Section 3. The statistical uncertainty principle and the envy-efficiency uncertainty principle are presented in Section 4. Concentration results on the optimal solution in hindsight is presented in Section 5. Our proposed allocation algorithm and its theoretical guarantees are in Section 6 and Section 7. The experiments are in Section 8.

2 Related Work

Fairness in resource allocation and the use of Nash Social Welfare was pioneered by Varian in his seminal work [46, 47]. Since then researchers have investigated fairness properties for both offline and online allocation, in settings with divisible or indivisible resources, and when either the individuals or resources arrive online. We now briefly discuss some related works; see [3] for a comprehensive survey. What distinguishes our setting from many of the previous works is that we consider the online Bayesian setting with a known distribution. Many previous works are either limited to offline or non-adaptive algorithms, or consider adversarial online arrivals.

Food Bank and Health Care Operations: There is a growing body of work in the operations research literature addressing logistics and supply chain issues in the area of humanitarian relief, health-care, and food distribution [42, 39, 5, 50, 28]. The research focuses on designing systems which balance efficiency, effectiveness, and equity. In [22] they study the logistical challenges of managing vehicles with limited capacity to distribute food and provide routing and scheduling protocols. In [32, 34] they consider sequential allocation with an alternative objective of maximizing the minimum utility (also called the leximin in the literature [37]). We instead consider sequential allocation of resources under the objectives of achieving approximate fairness notions with regards to envy and efficiency.

Cake Cutting: Cake cutting serves as a model for dividing a continuous object (whether that be a cake, advertisement space, land, etc) [17, 41]. Under this model, prior work considers situations where individuals arrive and depart during the process of dividing a resource, where the utility of an agent is a set-function on the interval of the resource received. Researchers analyze the offline setting to develop algorithms to allocate the resource with a minimal number of cuts [18], or online under adversarial arrivals [49]. Our model instead imposes stochastic assumptions on the number of arriving individuals and characterizes probabilistic instead of sample-path fairness criteria.

Online Resources: One line of work considers the resource (here to be thought of as the units of food, processing power, etc) are online and the agents are fixed [13, 4, 36, 35, 2, 9, 10, 16]. In [51]

they study the tradeoffs between fairness and efficiency when items arrive under several adversarial models. Another common criteria is designing algorithms which are *envy-free up to one item*, where researchers design algorithms that can reallocate previously allocated items, but try to minimize these adjustments [27, 8]. These problems are in contrast to our model where instead the resources are fixed and depleting over time, and individuals arrive online.

Online Individuals: The other setting more similar to our work considers agents as arriving online and the resources as fixed. In [29] they consider this setting where the resources are indivisible with the goal of maximizing utilitarian welfare (or the sum of utilities) which provides no guarantees on individual fairness. Another approach in [25] considers a scheduling setting where agents arrive and depart online. Each agent has a fixed and known arrival time, departure time, and demand. The goal then is to determine a schedule and allocation which is Pareto-efficient and envy-free.

Non-adaptive Allocations: A separate line of research considers fairness questions for resource allocations in a similar setting where the utilities across groups are drawn from known probability distributions [20, 23, 34]. This line of work investigates probabilistic versions of fairness, where the goal is to quantify the discrepancy between the objectives of ensuring the expected utilization of the resources is large (ex-ante Pareto-optimal), while the probability of receiving the resource is proportional across groups (ex-ante proportional). However, they consider algorithms which decide on the entire allocation for each agent upfront before observing the utilities for any individuals rather than adaptive policies.

Adaptive Allocations: In contrast, we consider a model where the principal makes decisions on how much of the resources after witnessing the number of individuals in a round. Most similar to our work is recent work analyzing a setting where individuals arrive over time and do not depart, so that the algorithm can allocate additional resources to individuals who arrived in the past [30]. We instead consider a stochastic setting where individuals arrive and depart in the same step with the goal of characterizing allocations that cannot reallocate to previous agents. Other papers either seek competitive ratios in terms of the Nash Social Welfare objective [7, 11, 9], or derive allocation algorithms which perform well in terms of max-min [32, 34].

3 Preliminaries

We use \mathbb{R}_+ to denote the set of non-negative reals, and $\|X\|_\infty = \max_{i,j} |X_{i,j}|$ to denote the matrix maximum norm, and cX to denote entry-wise multiplication for a constant c . When comparing vectors, we use $X \leq Y$ to denote that each component $X_i \leq Y_i$.

3.1 Model and Assumptions

A principal is tasked with dividing K divisible resources among a population of individuals who are divided between T distinct rounds – these could represent T locations visited sequentially by the principal (for example, food distribution sites visited by a mobile pantry), or T consecutive time periods (for example, days over which a hospital must stretch some limited medical supply before it is restocked).

Each resource $k \in [K]$ has a fixed initial budget B_k that the principal can allocate across these rounds. Each round has a (possibly random) set of individuals arriving to request a share of the resources. Individuals are characterized by their type $\theta \in \Theta$, corresponding to their preferences over the K resources, where individuals of type θ receive utility $u(x, \theta) : \mathbb{R}^K \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for an allocation x . We henceforth assume that the set of possible types has finite cardinality $|\Theta|$, and denote $(N_{t,\theta})_{\theta \in \Theta}$ to be the vector containing the number of arrivals of each type in round t , where

$N_{t,\theta}$ denotes the number of type- θ arrivals. Each $(N_{t,\theta})_{\theta \in \Theta}$ is drawn from some *known* distribution \mathcal{F}_t ; note that these distributions across rounds need not be identical.

In the ex-post or *offline* setting, the number of individuals per round $(N_{t,\theta})_{t \in [T], \theta \in \Theta}$ are known in advance and can be used by the principal to choose allocations $X \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times |\Theta| \times K}$ for individuals in each round t of type θ . In the *online* setting the principal considers each round sequentially in a fixed order $t = 1, \dots, T$, is informed of the number of individuals $(N_{t,\theta})_{\theta \in \Theta} \sim \mathcal{F}_t$ in that round, chooses allocation $X_t^{alg} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Theta| \times K}$ before continuing on to the next round, where $X_{t,\theta,k}^{alg}$ denotes the allocation of resource k earmarked for each of the $N_{t,\theta}$ individuals of type θ in that round. We impose the additional assumption that the algorithm allocates the same allocation to each of the $N_{t,\theta}$ individuals of type θ . This is without loss of generality, as one of the primary goals of the paper is to investigate envy, whereby one out of any two individuals of type θ in round t will envy the other unless their allocations are the same. Allocation decisions are irreversible, and must obey the overall budget constraints.

Assumptions: We assume that for every $t \in [T]$ and $\theta \in \Theta$ we have that $N_{t,\theta} \geq 1$ almost surely. We also assume that $N_{t,\theta}$ are independent, with variance $\text{Var}[N_{t,\theta}] = \sigma_{t,\theta} > 0$, and mean absolute deviation $|N_{t,\theta} - \mathbb{E}[N_{t,\theta}]| = \rho_{t,\theta} < \infty$ almost surely. We define $\beta_{avg} = \frac{B}{\sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \sum_{t \in [T]} \mathbb{E}[N_{t,\theta}]} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ as the average resource per individual; for ease of understanding, β_{avg} can be viewed as being a constant, but our results hold for any β_{avg} . We additionally define $\sigma_{min}^2 = \min_{t,\theta} \sigma_{t,\theta}^2$, $\sigma_{max}^2 = \max_{t,\theta} \sigma_{t,\theta}^2$ and $\mu_{max} = \max_{t,\theta} \mathbb{E}[N_{t,\theta}]$, and assume that $\sigma_{min}^2, \sigma_{max}^2, \mu_{max}$ are given constants. These assumptions are strictly for ease of notation; in particular, our results only depend on mild conditions on the expectation and tails of the sums of future arrivals $\sum_{t' > t} N_{t',\theta}$ of each type.

We also primarily focus on utility functions that are linear, i.e., where $u(x, \theta) = \langle w_\theta, x \rangle$, where the latent individual type θ is characterized by $w_\theta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^K$ as a vector of *preferences* over each of the different resources. Here again, we believe that our techniques extend to more general homothetic preferences, but for ease of notation (and given the richness of linear utilities), choose to focus on these. More details on modeling individual utilities are in Section 8.

Finally, we assume that our resources are *divisible*, in that allocations can take values in \mathbb{R}_+^K . In our particular regimes of interest where we scale the number of rounds and budgets, this is easy to relax to integer allocations with vanishing loss in performance.

Additional Notation: We use $B = (B_1, \dots, B_K)$ the budget vector. For any location t and type θ , we use $N_{\geq t, \theta}$ to denote $\sum_{t' \geq t} N_{t', \theta}$. If the subscript t is omitted we use $N_\theta = \sum_{t=1}^T N_{t, \theta}$ to denote the total number of individuals of type θ . We additionally let $\bar{\rho}_{\geq t, \theta} = \frac{1}{T-t} \sum_{t' \geq t} \rho_{t', \theta}$ and similarly for $\bar{\sigma}_{\geq t, \theta}^2$ and $\bar{\mu}_{\geq t, \theta}$. A table with all our notation is provided in the Appendix.

Limitations and Extensions: The assumption that latent types Θ are finite is common in decision-making settings, as in practice, the set of possible types is approximated from historical data. One limiting assumption is that in the online setting, the principal only knows the number of individuals from one location at a time. In reality the principal could have some additional information about future locations, e.g. via calling ahead, that could be incorporated in deciding an allocation. Our algorithmic approach naturally incorporates such additional information.

3.2 Fairness and Efficiency in Offline Allocations

To define an ex-post fair allocation, i.e., with known number of individuals $(N_{t,\theta})_{t \in [T], \theta \in \Theta}$ across rounds in $[T]$, we adopt an approach proposed by [46] (commonly referred to as ‘Varian Fairness’), which is widely used in the operations research and economics literature. We will refer to this as fairness for brevity; for a more detailed discussion on the advantages and limitations of this model, see [45] or Appendix B.

Definition 3.1 (Fair Allocation). *Given types $(\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$, number of individuals of each type $(N_{t,\theta})_{t \in [T], \theta \in \Theta}$ and utility functions $(u(\cdot, \theta))_{\theta \in \Theta}$, an allocation $X = \{X_{t,\theta} \in \mathbb{R}_+^K \mid \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_{t,\theta} X_{t,\theta} \leq B\}$ is said to be fair if it simultaneously satisfies the following:*

1. *Envy-Freeness (EF): For every pair of rounds t, t' and types θ, θ' , we have $u(X_{t,\theta}, \theta) \geq u(X_{t',\theta'}, \theta)$.*
2. *Pareto-Efficiency (PE): For any allocation $Y \neq X$ such that $u(Y_{t,\theta}, \theta) > u(X_{t,\theta}, \theta)$ for some round t and type θ , there exists some other round t' and type θ' such that $u(Y_{t',\theta'}, \theta') < u(X_{t',\theta'}, \theta')$.*
3. *Proportional (Prop): For any round t , type θ we have $u(X_{t,\theta}, \theta) \geq u(B/N, \theta)$ where $N = \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_{t,\theta}$.*

While the three properties form natural desiderata for a fair allocation, the power of this definition lies in that asking for them to hold simultaneously rules out many natural (but unfair) allocation policies. In particular, allocation rules based on maximizing a global function such as utilitarian welfare (sum of individual utilities) or egalitarian welfare (the maximin allocation, or more generally, the leximin allocation [15, 32, 34] where one maximizes the minimum utility, and subject to that the second minimum, and so on) are Pareto-efficient, but tend to violate individual envy-freeness, as they focus on global optimality rather than per-individual guarantees. A remarkable exception to this, however, is the Nash Social Welfare, whose maximization leads to an allocation that is Pareto-efficient, envy-free, and proportional, and hence fair.

Proposition 3.2 (Theorem 2.3 in [46]). *For allocation X , its Nash Social Welfare is defined as:*

$$NSW(X) = \prod_{t \in [T]} \prod_{\theta \in \Theta} u(X_{t,\theta}, \theta)^{N_{t,\theta}}. \quad (1)$$

An allocation X that maximizes $NSW(X)$ is Pareto-efficient, envy-free, and proportional (hence fair).

In addition to simultaneously ensuring PE, EF and Prop properties, the NSW maximizing solution can also be efficiently computed via the following convex program called the *Eisenberg-Gale* program [21], obtained by taking the logarithm of the Nash Social Welfare:

$$\max_{X \in \mathbb{R}_+^{T \times \Theta \times K}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_{t,\theta} \log(u(X_{t,\theta}, \theta)) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_{t,\theta} X_{t,\theta} \leq B \quad (2)$$

Important to note in our setting, is that the optimal fair allocation in hindsight, which solves Eq. (2) with a given number of individuals of each type across all rounds $(N_{t,\theta})_{t \in [T], \theta \in \Theta}$, does not depend on the round t . Indeed, any envy-free allocation can be formulated so $X_{t,\theta} = X_{t',\theta}$ (by setting $X_\theta = \frac{1}{t} \sum_t X_{t,\theta}$) and so we can instead consider the solution to:

$$\max_{X \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\Theta \times K}} \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_\theta \log(u(X_\theta, \theta)) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_\theta X_\theta \leq B \quad (3)$$

where we use $N_\theta = \sum_{t \in [T]} N_{t,\theta}$ to denote the total number of individuals across all rounds of type θ . The fact that the optimal solution in hindsight does not depend on the round t forms the basis for our algorithm GUARDED-HOPE.

3.3 Approximate Fairness and Efficiency in Online Allocations

Recall that in our online setting the principal allocates resources across each round in a fixed order $t = 1, \dots, T$, whereupon at round t the principal sees $(N_{t,\theta})_{\theta \in \Theta}$ and decides on an allocation before continuing to the next round. A natural (albeit naive) approach in this setting could be to try and obtain allocations which satisfy Pareto-efficiency and envy-freeness on all sample paths. However, such an approach is not feasible even in the simplest online setting, as the optimal solution in hindsight is often a unique function of the realized number of individuals across each rounds.

Proposition 3.3. *For $T = 2$ rounds, $|\Theta| = 1$ type, single resource and linear utilities, for any non-trivial distribution \mathcal{F}_2 , no online algorithm can guarantee ex-post envy-freeness and Pareto-efficiency almost surely.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}_2 \sim 1 + \text{BERNOULLI}(p)$ with $p \in (0, 1)$. For any value of N_1 with probability p the optimal solution is $X_{opt} = B/(N_1 + 1)$, else $X_{opt} = B/(N_1 + 2)$. As any algorithm must decide how much to allocate at round $t = 1$ without knowledge of N_2 , no algorithm can match the ex-post fair solution almost surely. \square

Proposition 3.3 shows that trying to simultaneously achieve ex-post envy-freeness and Pareto-efficiency is futile, and hence we need to consider approximate fairness notions. To this end, we define the *counterfactual distance* of an allocation from envy-freeness and efficiency. These guarantees focus on ensuring individuals receive utility close to what they *should have* received with the fair allocation in hindsight.

Definition 3.4 (Ex-Post distance from Envy-Freeness and Efficiency). *Given individuals with types $(\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$, sizes $(N_{t,\theta})_{t \in [T], \theta \in \Theta}$, and resource budgets $(B_k)_{k \in [K]}$, for any online allocation $(X_{t,\theta}^{alg})_{t \in [T], \theta \in \Theta} \in \mathbb{R}^k$, we define: the counterfactual distance of X^{alg} to envy-freeness as*

$$\Delta_{EF} \triangleq \max_{t \in [T], \theta \in \Theta} \|u(X_{t,\theta}^{alg}, \theta) - u(X_{t,\theta}^{opt}, \theta)\|_\infty$$

where X^{opt} is the optimal fair allocation in hindsight, i.e. the solution to Eq. (3) with true values $(N_{t,\theta})_{t \in [T], \theta \in \Theta}$. The counterfactual distance to efficiency is defined as

$$\Delta_{efficiency} \triangleq \sum_{k \in K} \left(B_k - \sum_{t \in [T]} \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_{t,\theta} X_{t,\theta,k}^{alg} \right)$$

Note these are all random quantities, depending on both the realized types and the randomness in the allocation algorithm. Our algorithm also provides ex-post guarantees for other metrics of interest proposed. In particular, there are notions of *hindsight envy and proportionality* which measure the distance to envy of the allocation made by the algorithm itself, separate from the offline allocation X^{opt} [44].

Definition 3.5 (Hindsight Distance from EF and Prop). *Given individuals of type $(\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$, number of individuals per round $(N_{t,\theta})_{t \in [T], \theta \in \Theta}$, utility functions $u(x, \theta)$, and resource budget $(B_k)_{k \in [K]}$, for any online allocation $X^{alg} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times |\Theta| \times K}$ we define:*

1. The hindsight distance of X^{alg} to envy-freeness as

$$\text{ENVY} \triangleq \max_{t, t', \theta, \theta'} u(X_{t', \theta'}^{alg}, \theta) - u(X_{t, \theta}^{alg}, \theta)$$

2. The hindsight distance of X^{alg} to proportionality as

$$\Delta_{prop} \triangleq \max_{t,\theta} u\left(\frac{B}{\sum_{t,\theta} N_{t,\theta}}, \theta\right) - u(X_{t,\theta}^{alg}, \theta)$$

We note that all of these metrics are much stronger than the existing metrics in the literature because we provide hindsight guarantees that hold with high probability with respect to the distribution as opposed to weaker ex-ante guarantees that only hold in expectation. Moreover, satisfying exactly one of these properties is trivially achievable in online settings. A solution which allocates $X_{t,\theta}^{alg} = 0$ to each individual trivially satisfies $\text{ENVY} = 0$. The solution that allocates all resources in the first round $t = 0$ trivially satisfies $\Delta_{efficiency} = 0$. The *import challenge* in this setting then is considering meaningful trade-offs between these metrics in the online setting (see Fig. 1).

As highlighted earlier, the definition of counterfactual envy and efficiency are related. By using the fact that the optimal solution in hindsight X^{opt} is efficient, we can naively bound $\Delta_{efficiency}$ using Δ_{EF} ,

$$\Delta_{efficiency} = \sum_{t \in [T]} \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \sum_{k \in K} N_{t,\theta} (X_{t,\theta,k}^{opt} - X_{t,\theta,k}^{alg}) \leq \frac{TK\Delta_{EF}}{\|w\|_{min}} \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_{\theta}.$$

This naive bound is loose, with unnecessary dependence on the number of locations T (see the *Envy-Efficiency Uncertainty Principle* in Section 4).

4 Uncertainty Principles

In this section we show (1) and (2) from Informal Theorem 1 concerning lower bounds on the achievable Δ_{EF} due to the statistical uncertainty in the number of individuals arriving over time, and the relationship between Δ_{EF} and $\Delta_{efficiency}$ due to the envy-efficiency uncertainty principle.

We begin with the statistical uncertainty principle on the optimal fair allocation in hindsight, showing that no online algorithm is able to achieve an envy smaller than order $1/\sqrt{T}$. We consider the case of a single resource, single type, and assume that $u(X, \theta) = X$ for brevity and clarity in the presentation. However, the proof extends directly to multiple resources, where one considers the setting where $|\Theta| = K$ and each type θ desires a unique resource.

Theorem 4.1 (Statistical Uncertainty Principle). *Let α be a constant with $\alpha + \frac{C\rho_{max}}{\sigma_{min}^3\sqrt{T}} < \frac{1}{2}$ where C is an absolute constant. Then with probability at least α any online algorithm must incur*

$$\Delta_{EF} \geq \beta_{avg} \frac{\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha - \frac{C\rho_{max}}{\sigma_{min}^3\sqrt{T}})\sigma_{min}}{\sqrt{T}}.$$

Proof. We use the generalized Berry-Esseen theorem [14]. Recall that for all t , $\text{Var}[N_t] = \sigma_t > 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[|N_t - \mathbb{E}[N_t]|] = \rho_t < \infty$, and moreover, $X_t^{opt} = B/N$ for all t where $N = \sum_{t \in [T]} N_t$. Let us denote $\bar{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \sigma_t^2$ and $\bar{\rho} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \in [T]} \rho_t$, and let Φ be the CDF of a standard normal. Using Berry-Esseen it holds that for an absolute constant C , for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\Phi(z) - \frac{C\bar{\rho}}{\bar{\sigma}^3\sqrt{T}} \leq \mathbb{P}\left(X_{opt} \geq \frac{B}{\mathbb{E}[N] + z\bar{\sigma}\sqrt{T}}\right) \leq \Phi(z) + \frac{C\bar{\rho}}{\bar{\sigma}^3\sqrt{T}}.$$

Taking $z = -y$ and using the lower bound we have that with probability at least $\Phi(-y) - \frac{C\bar{\rho}}{\sigma^3\sqrt{T}}$,

$$X^{opt} \geq \frac{B}{\mathbb{E}[N] - y\bar{\sigma}\sqrt{T}} \geq \frac{B}{\mathbb{E}[N]} \left(1 + \frac{y\bar{\sigma}\sqrt{T}}{\mathbb{E}[N]} \right).$$

Taking $z = y$ and using the upper bound we have that with probability at least $\Phi(-y) - \frac{C\bar{\rho}}{\sigma^3\sqrt{T}}$,

$$X^{opt} \leq \frac{B}{\mathbb{E}[N] + y\bar{\sigma}\sqrt{T}} \leq \frac{B}{\mathbb{E}[N]} \left(1 - \frac{y\bar{\sigma}\sqrt{T}}{\mathbb{E}[N]} \right).$$

Note that these intervals are non-overlapping for $y > 0$. As the algorithm must decide on a value X_1^{alg} to allocate for the first round then with probability at least $\Phi(-y) - \frac{C\bar{\rho}}{\sigma^3\sqrt{T}} \geq \Phi(-y) - \frac{C\rho_{max}}{\sigma_{min}^3\sqrt{T}}$:

$$\|X^{alg} - X^{opt}\|_{\infty} \geq \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \max \left(\left| \frac{B}{\mathbb{E}[N]} \left(1 - \frac{y\bar{\sigma}\sqrt{T}}{\mathbb{E}[N]} \right) - x \right|, \left| \frac{B}{\mathbb{E}[N]} \left(1 + \frac{y\bar{\sigma}\sqrt{T}}{\mathbb{E}[N]} \right) - x \right| \right) = \frac{B}{\mathbb{E}[N]} \frac{y\bar{\sigma}\sqrt{T}}{\mathbb{E}[N]}.$$

Taking $y = \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha - \frac{C\rho_{max}}{\sigma_{min}^3\sqrt{T}})$ which is positive then we get with probability at least α that

$$\|X^{alg} - X^{opt}\|_{\infty} \geq \frac{B}{\mathbb{E}[N]} \frac{\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha - \frac{C\rho_{max}}{\sigma_{min}^3\sqrt{T}})\bar{\sigma}}{\mathbb{E}[N]} \geq \beta_{avg} \frac{\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha - \frac{C\rho_{max}}{\sigma_{min}^3\sqrt{T}})\sigma_{min}}{\sqrt{T}}.$$

□

We next show the Envy-Efficiency Uncertainty principle, highlighting that any online algorithm which achieves a factor of L_T on envy necessarily suffers efficiency of at least $1/L_T$. This result follows from the statistical uncertainty in the number of individuals arriving in the final L_T^{-2} rounds, and the fact that ensuring a bounded envy requires any online algorithm to save enough budget to allocate a minimum allocation to all future arriving individuals.

Theorem 4.2 (Envy-Efficiency Uncertainty Principle). *Let $\alpha < \frac{1}{6}$ be a constant such that $3\alpha + \frac{C\rho_{max}}{\sigma_{min}^3\sqrt{T}} < \frac{1}{2}$ for an absolute constant C . Any online algorithm which achieves $\Delta_{EF} \leq L_T = o(1)$ with probability at least $1 - \alpha$ must also incur waste*

$$\Delta_{efficiency} \geq (\beta_{avg} - o(1))^2 \frac{\Phi^{-1}(1 - 3\alpha - \frac{C\rho_{max}}{\sigma_{min}^3\sqrt{T}})^2 \sigma_{min}^2}{L_T \mu_{max}}$$

with probability at least $\frac{1}{12} - o(1)$.

Proof. In order for the algorithm to guarantee that $\|X^{alg} - X^{opt}\| \leq L_T$ with probability at least $1 - \alpha$ it must limit all allocations to the interval $[\frac{B}{N} - L_T, \frac{B}{N} + L_T]$ as $X^{opt} = \frac{B}{N}$. We will denote this event by

$$\mathcal{D} = \bigcap_{t \in [T]} \left\{ X_t^{alg} \in \left[\frac{B}{N} - L_T, \frac{B}{N} + L_T \right] \right\}.$$

Recall that we use the notation B_t^{alg} to denote the budget remaining for the algorithm at the start of round t . We begin by defining four events for a fixed round $t \leq T$ and constant $z = \Phi^{-1}(1 - 3\alpha - \frac{C\rho_{max}}{\sigma_{min}^3\sqrt{T}}) > 0$:

$$\mathcal{A} = \{N_{\geq t} \leq \mathbb{E}[N_{\geq t}]\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B} &= \{N_{\geq t} \geq \mathbb{E}[N_{\geq t}] + z\bar{\sigma}_{\geq t}\sqrt{T-t+1}\} \\
\mathcal{C} &= \{B_t^{alg} \geq \left(\frac{B}{N} - L_T\right) \left(\mathbb{E}[N_{\geq t}] + z\bar{\sigma}_{\geq t}\sqrt{T-t+1}\right)\} \\
\mathcal{E} &= \{|N - \mathbb{E}[N]| \leq \sqrt{6\rho_{max}^2 T}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Berry-Esseen theorem we know that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{C\bar{\rho}_{\geq t}}{\bar{\sigma}_{\geq t}^3\sqrt{T-t+1}} \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{C\rho_{max}}{\sigma_{min}^3\sqrt{T}}$ and that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}) \geq \Phi(-z) - \frac{C\bar{\rho}_{\geq t}}{\bar{\sigma}_{\geq t}^3\sqrt{T-t+1}} \geq 3\alpha$ by choice of z . A simple application of Hoeffding's inequality shows that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{12}$.

First consider the event $\neg\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}$. We show that $\neg\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}$ implies $\neg\mathcal{D}$ (or equivalently that \mathcal{D} implies that \mathcal{B} implies \mathcal{C}) such that $\mathbb{P}(\neg\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\neg\mathcal{D})$. These two conditions implies that the algorithm must have a lot of budget by allocating within the interval $[\frac{B}{N} - L_T, \frac{B}{N} + L_T]$ based on the number of individuals arriving in the future being small. Indeed, under events \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{B} we have that

$$B_t^{alg} \geq \sum_{t' \geq t} N_{t'} X_{t'}^{alg} \geq N_{\geq t} \left(\frac{B}{N} - L_T\right) \geq (\mathbb{E}[N_{\geq t}] + z\bar{\sigma}_{\geq t}\sqrt{T-t+1}) \left(\frac{B}{N} - L_T\right).$$

Moreover, due to the fact that the algorithm is non-anticipatory, we know that the events \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{B} are independent. Thus we have that $\mathbb{P}(\neg\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{B}) = \mathbb{P}(\neg\mathcal{C})\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B})$. Using the bound on $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B})$ and the fact that $\mathbb{P}(\neg\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{B}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\neg\mathcal{D}) \leq \alpha$ we get that $\mathbb{P}(\neg\mathcal{C}) \leq \frac{1}{3}$.

Now we consider the event $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{E}$. Using that the allocations must be bounded by event \mathcal{D} we have that the waste will be at least:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{efficiency} &= B - \sum_{i=1}^T X_i^{alg} N_i = B_t^{alg} - \sum_{i \geq t} X_i^{alg} N_i \\
&\geq \left(\mathbb{E}[N_{\geq t}] + z\bar{\sigma}_{\geq t}\sqrt{T-t+1}\right) \left(\frac{B}{N} - L_T\right) - \left(\frac{B}{N} + L_T\right) \mathbb{E}[N_{\geq t}] \\
&= \left(\frac{B}{N} - L_T\right) z\bar{\sigma}_{\geq t}\sqrt{T-t+1} - 2L_T \mathbb{E}[N_{\geq t}].
\end{aligned}$$

The inequality follows from lower bounding B_t^{alg} with the amount required to be reserved up to location t (i.e. event \mathcal{C}), and upper bounding the maximum amount of budget that can be expended for locations $i \geq t$ when $N_{\geq t} \leq \mathbb{E}[N_{\geq t}]$ (i.e. event \mathcal{A}).

Recall that $\mathbb{E}[N_{\geq t}] = (T-t+1)\bar{\mu}_{\geq t}$, so that while the first term increases with $(T-t+1)$, the second term decreases with $(T-t+1)$. Setting the two terms equal to each other, solving for $T-t+1$ results in

$$\Delta_{efficiency} \geq \left(\frac{B}{N} - L_T\right)^2 \frac{z^2 \bar{\sigma}_{\geq t}^2}{L_T \bar{\mu}_{\geq t}} \geq (B - L_T)^2 \frac{z^2 \sigma_{min}^2}{L_T \mu_{max}}.$$

However, under the event \mathcal{E} we can lower bound $\frac{B}{N}$ by:

$$\frac{B}{N} \geq \frac{B}{\mathbb{E}[N] + \sqrt{6\rho_{max}^2 T}} = \beta_{avg}(1 - o(1)).$$

The probability of this event is lower bounded by $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{E}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{A}) - \mathbb{P}(\neg\mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(\neg\mathcal{E}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C})\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) - \alpha - \frac{1}{12} \geq (1 - \frac{1}{3})(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{C\rho_{max}}{\sigma_{min}^3\sqrt{T}}) - \alpha \geq \frac{1}{12} - o(1)$. Plugging in the value of z and the lower bound on B/N yields the final result. \square

5 Concentration on Counterfactual Optimal Fair Allocation in Hindsight

Motivated by the lower bounds presented in Section 4, one issue in developing an online allocation algorithm is to generate approximations to the optimal solution in hindsight, X^{opt} , which guarantee an approximation to $u(X_\theta^{opt}, \theta)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$, and hence a bound on Δ_{EF} . Inspired by the use of *guardrails* for satisfying the Δ_{EF} guarantee in the proof of Theorem 4.2, we now shift our focus to developing estimates \underline{X}_θ and \overline{X}_θ which satisfy that with probability at least $1 - \delta$:

$$u(\underline{X}_\theta, \theta) \leq u(X_\theta^{opt}, \theta) \leq u(\overline{X}_\theta, \theta) \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta \quad (4)$$

$$\|u(\overline{X}_\theta, \theta) - u(\underline{X}_\theta, \theta)\|_\infty \leq L_T \text{ for any } L_T \gtrsim \sqrt{\frac{\log(T|\Theta|/\delta)}{T}}. \quad (5)$$

Note that if we were to find such \underline{X}_θ and guarantee that with high probability the algorithm is able to allocate it at every iteration, a simple algorithm would be to allocate $X_{t,\theta}^{alg} = \underline{X}_\theta$ to each of the $N_{t,\theta}$ individuals in round t . Such a simple allocation algorithm will trivially satisfy that $\Delta_{EF} \leq L_T$, but the problem would be that such an approach ensures that $\Delta_{efficiency} \geq TL_T$, and hence would not meet the envy-efficiency uncertainty principle.

For the time being, we assume that we are given concentration inequalities of the form: with probability at least $1 - \delta$ we have that for every t and θ , $|\mathbb{E}[N_{>t,\theta}] - N_{>t,\theta}| \leq \text{CONF}_{t,\theta}$. As this concentration only depends on the assumptions on the variables $N_{t,\theta}$, we include a simple form of $\text{CONF}_{t,\theta}$ scaling via $\sqrt{T-t}$ via Hoeffding's inequality in Lemma 5.3. Note that while the concentration on X^{opt} only needs $\text{CONF}_{t,\theta}$ for $t=0$, by allocating according to \underline{X}_θ in all rounds, one can ensure that the algorithm does not run out of budget with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Next consider the Eisenberg-Gale program from Section 3 with multiple types θ and K resources as specified in Eq. (3). Recall that the dual variables corresponding to the budget feasibility constraint p_k , can be thought of as *prices* for the corresponding resources [38]. We start with a lemma showing properties of the optimal solution to the Eisenberg-Gale program with various number of individuals of each type vectors $(N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$.

Lemma 5.1 (Sensitivity of solutions to the Eisenberg-Gale Program). *Let $x((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$ and $p((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$ denote the optimal primal and dual solution to the Eisenberg-Gale program (Eq. (3)) for a given vector of individuals of each type $(N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$. Then we have that:*

1. *Scaling: If $\tilde{N}_\theta = (1 + \zeta)N_\theta$ for every $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\zeta > 0$ then we have that:*

$$\begin{aligned} x((\tilde{N}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}) &= \frac{x((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})}{1 + \zeta} \\ p((\tilde{N}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}) &= (1 + \zeta)p((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}) \\ u(x((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}), \theta) - u(x((\tilde{N}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}), \theta) &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + \zeta}\right) \max_k \frac{w_{\theta,k}}{p((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})_k}. \end{aligned}$$

2. *Monotonicity: If $N_\theta \leq \tilde{N}_\theta$ for every $\theta \in \Theta$ then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} p((\tilde{N}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}) &\geq p((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}) \\ u(x((\tilde{N}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}), \theta) &\leq u(x((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}), \theta) \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta \end{aligned}$$

These Lipschitz properties follow from the standard Fisher market interpretation of the Eisenberg-Gale optimum, which corresponds to market-clearing allocations in a setting with $|\Theta|$ agents, each with an endowment or budget of N_θ ; see Chapter 5 of [38] and Appendix D for the full proof.

Recall that our goal is to construct high probability upper and lower bounds on $u(X_\theta^{opt}, \theta) = u(x((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}), \theta)$ where $N_\theta = \sum_t N_{\theta,t}$ is the true (random) number of individuals of type θ arriving over all rounds. If we were able to construct $\underline{n}_\theta \leq N_\theta$ for all θ and $\bar{n}_\theta \geq N_\theta$ for all θ then by monotonicity we would have that $u(x((\bar{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}), \theta) \leq u(x((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}), \theta) \leq u(x((\underline{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}), \theta)$ (i.e. satisfy Lemma 5.1). Then, we would just need to ensure that $\bar{n}_\theta = (1 + \zeta)\underline{n}_\theta$ for some value ζ in order to use the scaling property and satisfy Eq. (4).

Theorem 5.2 (Concentration of $u(X_\theta^{opt}, \theta)$). *Let $X^{opt} = x((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$ denote the optimal solution to the Eisenberg-Gale program for a given vector of individuals of each type $(N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$. Further suppose that with probability at least $1 - \delta$ we have for all $\theta \in \Theta$: $|N_\theta - \mathbb{E}[N_\theta]| \leq \text{CONF}_\theta$ with $\max_\theta \frac{\text{CONF}_\theta}{\mathbb{E}[N_\theta]} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Given any*

$$L_T \geq 2 \frac{\|w\|_\infty^2}{\|w\|_{\min} \|\beta_{avg}\|_{\min}} \max_\theta \frac{\text{CONF}_\theta}{\mathbb{E}[N_\theta]}$$

and setting:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{n}_\theta &= \mathbb{E}[N_\theta] \left(1 + \max_\theta \frac{\text{CONF}_\theta}{\mathbb{E}[N_\theta]} \right) \\ \underline{n}_\theta &= \mathbb{E}[N_\theta] (1 - c) \\ \text{for } c &= \frac{\|w\|_{\min} \|\beta_{avg}\|_{\min}}{\|w\|_\infty^2} L_T \left(1 + \max_\theta \frac{\text{CONF}_\theta}{\mathbb{E}[N_\theta]} \right) - \max_\theta \frac{\text{CONF}_\theta}{\mathbb{E}[N_\theta]}. \end{aligned}$$

Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ we have that for $X^{opt} = x((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$ and all $\theta \in \Theta$:

1. $\underline{n}_\theta \leq N_\theta \leq \bar{n}_\theta$
2. $u(x((\bar{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}), \theta) \leq u(X_\theta^{opt}, \theta) \leq u(x((\bar{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}), \theta)$
3. $u(x((\underline{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}), \theta) - u(x((\bar{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}), \theta) \leq L_T$
4. $\|x((\bar{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}) - x((\underline{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})\|_\infty \geq L_T \frac{\|\beta_{avg}\|_{\min}^2 \|w\|_{\min}}{\|w\|_\infty}$.
5. $\|x((\bar{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}) - x((\underline{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})\|_\infty \leq L_T \frac{\|B\|_\infty \|\beta_{avg}\|_{\min} \|w\|_{\min}}{\|w\|_\infty}$

Proof. First notice that via our concentration guarantees:

$$\begin{aligned} N_\theta &= \mathbb{E}[N_\theta] + (N_\theta - \mathbb{E}[N_\theta]) = \mathbb{E}[N_\theta] \left(1 + \frac{N_\theta - \mathbb{E}[N_\theta]}{\mathbb{E}[N_\theta]} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[N_\theta] \left(1 + \frac{\text{CONF}_\theta}{\mathbb{E}[N_\theta]} \right) \leq \mathbb{E}[N_\theta] \left(1 + \max_\theta \frac{\text{CONF}_\theta}{\mathbb{E}[N_\theta]} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we can show that $N_\theta \geq \mathbb{E}[N_\theta] \left(1 - \max_\theta \frac{\text{CONF}_\theta}{\mathbb{E}[N_\theta]} \right)$. By construction then we have that $\bar{n}_\theta \geq N_\theta$. Simple algebraic manipulations and the assumption shows that $c \geq \max_\theta \frac{\text{CONF}_\theta}{\mathbb{E}[N_\theta]}$ and so $\underline{n}_\theta \leq N_\theta$ as well.

Define $\gamma = \max_\theta \text{CONF}_\theta / \mathbb{E}[N_\theta]$ and let $\bar{n}_\theta = \mathbb{E}[N_\theta] (1 + \gamma)$ and $\underline{n}_\theta = \mathbb{E}[N_\theta] (1 - c)$. This gives us that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $\theta \in \Theta$, $\underline{n}_\theta \leq N_\theta \leq \bar{n}_\theta$ and

$$\bar{n}_\theta = \frac{1 + \gamma}{1 - c} \underline{n}_\theta.$$

From the monotonicity property in Lemma 5.1 we have for all $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$u(x((\bar{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})_\theta, \theta) \leq u(X_\theta^{opt}, \theta) \leq u(x((\underline{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})_\theta, \theta)$$

Using Lemma 5.1 and Lemma D.2 it follows that the difference for any θ is bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned} u(x((\underline{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})_\theta, \theta) - u(x((\bar{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})_\theta, \theta) &= \left(1 - \frac{1-c}{1+\gamma}\right) \max_k \frac{w_{\theta,k}}{p((\underline{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})} \\ &\leq \frac{c+\gamma}{1+\gamma} \frac{\|w\|_\infty^2}{\|w\|_{\min} \|\beta_{avg}\|_{\min}} \\ &= L_T. \end{aligned}$$

Lastly via scaling we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x((\bar{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}) - x((\underline{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})\|_\infty &= \left(1 - \frac{1-c}{1+\gamma}\right) \|x((\underline{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})\|_\infty \\ &\geq \frac{c+\gamma}{1+\gamma} \|\beta_{avg}\|_{\min} \\ &= \frac{L_T \|\beta_{avg}\|_{\min} \|w\|_{\min}}{\|w\|_\infty} \|\beta_{avg}\|_{\min} \\ &= L_T \frac{\|\beta_{avg}\|_{\min}^2 \|w\|_{\min}}{\|w\|_\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

The upper bound is similar where we use $\|x((\underline{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})\|_\infty \leq \|B\|_\infty$. \square

Next we give an example of the desired form of the concentration inequalities to obtain γ . For almost surely bounded demands, under the assumptions outlined in Section 3, a simple application of Hoeffding's inequality gives:

Lemma 5.3. *With probability at least $1 - \delta$, for every $\theta \in \Theta$ and $t \in [T]$ we have that $|N_{>t,\theta} - \mathbb{E}[N_{>t,\theta}]| \leq \text{CONF}_{t,\theta}$ where*

$$\text{CONF}_{t,\theta} = \sqrt{2(T-t)\rho_{max}^2 \log(T|\Theta|/\delta)}.$$

Proof. Let t and θ be fixed. By assumption we know that $N_{t,\theta} \in [\mathbb{E}[N_{t,\theta}] - \rho_{t,\theta}, \mathbb{E}[N_{t,\theta}] + \rho_{t,\theta}]$. From a simple application of Hoeffding's inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}(|N_{>t,\theta} - \mathbb{E}[N_{>t,\theta}]| \geq \epsilon) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2\epsilon^2}{\sum_{t'>t} 4\rho_{t',\theta}^2}\right)$$

Setting the right hand side equal to δ , and relabeling δ to $\delta/T|\Theta|$ via a union bound shows the result. \square

Using this form of CONF_θ and Theorem 5.2, we notice that this construction ensures that we are able to guarantee a bound of L_T on the difference in utilities for any

$$\begin{aligned} L_T &\geq 2 \frac{\|w\|_\infty^2}{\|w\|_{\min} \|\beta_{avg}\|_{\min}} \max_\theta \frac{\sqrt{2T\rho_{max}^2 \log(T|\Theta|/\delta)}}{\mathbb{E}[N_\theta]} \\ &\geq 2 \frac{\|w\|_\infty^2}{\|w\|_{\min} \|\beta_{avg}\|_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{2\rho_{max}^2 \log(T|\Theta|/\delta)}{T}}. \end{aligned}$$

ALGORITHM 1: Histogram of Preference Estimates with Guardrails (GUARDED-HOPE)

Input: Budget B , $(\mathbb{E}[N_\theta])_{\theta \in \Theta}$, confidence terms $(\text{CONF}_{t,\theta})_{\theta \in \Theta}$, and a desired bound on envy L_T

Output: An allocation $X^{alg} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times |\Theta| \times K}$

Set $\gamma_t = \max_\theta \frac{\text{CONF}_{t,\theta}}{\mathbb{E}[N_{\geq t,\theta}]}$ for all $t \leq T$;

Solve for $\bar{X} = x(\underline{n}_\theta)$ as the solution to Eq. (3) where $\underline{n}_\theta = \mathbb{E}[N_\theta](1 - c)$ where c is defined via

Theorem 5.2

Solve for $\underline{X} = x(\bar{n}_\theta)$ as the solution to Eq. (3) where $\bar{n}_\theta = \mathbb{E}[N_\theta](1 + \gamma_1)$. // solve for guardrails

for rounds $t = 1, \dots, T - \tau$ **do**

for each resource $k \in [K]$ **do**

if $B_{t,k}^{alg} < \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_{t,\theta} \underline{X}_{\theta,k}$ **then** // insufficient budget to allocate lower guardrail

 Set $X_{t,\theta,k}^{alg} = \frac{B_{t,k}^{alg}}{\sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_{t,\theta}}$ for each $\theta \in \Theta$

else if $B_{t,k}^{alg} - \sum_{\theta} N_{t,\theta} \bar{X}_{\theta,k} \geq \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \underline{X}_{\theta,k} (\mathbb{E}[N_{>t,\theta}] + \text{CONF}_{t,\theta})$ **then** // use upper guardrail

 Set $X_{t,\theta,k}^{alg} = \bar{X}_{\theta,k}$ for each $\theta \in \Theta$

else // use lower guardrail

 Set $X_{t,\theta,k}^{alg} = \underline{X}_{\theta,k}$ for each $\theta \in \Theta$

end

 Update $B_{t+1}^{alg} = B_t^{alg} - \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_{t,\theta} X_{t,\theta}^{alg}$

end

return X^{alg}

6 Guarded-Hope

Here we define our algorithm GUARDED-HOPE. The algorithm takes as input a budget B , expected number of each type $(\mathbb{E}[N_\theta])_{\theta \in \Theta}$, confidence terms $(\text{CONF}_{t,\theta})_{\theta \in \Theta}$, and a desired bound L_T on the Δ_{EF} such that $L_T \gtrsim \max_\theta \frac{\text{CONF}_\theta}{\mathbb{E}[N_\theta]}$. Assuming the confidence terms are constructed such that we can guarantee the results from Theorem 5.2 our algorithm is able to achieve any envy-efficiency tradeoff as developed in Theorem 4.2. The algorithm relies on two main components, both of which we believe to be necessary in developing an algorithm to achieve the envy-efficiency uncertainty principle (as removing any one of them leads to breakdowns - as will be discussed in the Section 7). We start by describing the high level ideas needed in the algorithm before describing the pseudocode (with full algorithm description in Algorithm 1). The proof that GUARDED-HOPE achieves the desired bounds will be deferred to Section 7.

Guardrails on Optimal Fair Allocation in Hindsight

As a result of Theorem 4.1 we saw that no online algorithm can guarantee $\Delta_{EF} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}$. Moreover, the proof highlighted that any algorithm which satisfies a bound on $\Delta_{EF} \lesssim L_T$ must limit allocations based on guardrails with high probability. As such, our algorithm uses the construction from Section 5 to obtain estimates $\bar{X} = x((\underline{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$ and $\underline{X} = x((\bar{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$ which satisfy that

$$u(\underline{X}_\theta, \theta) \leq u(X_\theta^{opt}, \theta) \leq u(\bar{X}_\theta, \theta) \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{t,\theta} |u(\bar{X}_{t,\theta}, \theta) - u(\underline{X}_{t,\theta}, \theta)| \leq L_T.$$

The allocations \bar{X}_θ and \underline{X}_θ are used by the algorithm as *guardrails*, whereas all allocations made by the algorithm for a type θ are forced to fall within $[\underline{X}_\theta, \bar{X}_\theta]$. With this requirement, on sample paths where we do not run out of budget, then we trivially have an upper bound on $\Delta_{EF} \leq L_T$. Thus ‘accepting’ the first round loss in envy-freeness due to the statistical uncertainty in the problem allows us to limit all future allocations to the *guardrails* generated by that uncertainty.

Minimizing Waste via ‘Online Stochastic Packing’

Once the guardrails \bar{X}_θ and \underline{X}_θ are found to verify a bound on the approximate envy up to a

factor of L_T , we change the focus to instead try and minimize the loss of efficiency. Thanks to our guardrails, we develop the algorithm to match a clairvoyant benchmark policy which minimizes the resource waste with the knowledge of $(N_{t,\theta})_{t \in [T], \theta \in \Theta}$ while simultaneously limiting the allocations to lie between $[\underline{X}_\theta, \overline{X}_\theta]$. This reduction changes the measure of the performance of the algorithm to the performance of an online stochastic packing problem with the addition of *guardrails* (i.e. our minimum and maximum allocation constraints). However, in this setting, it amounts to ensuring that the budget remaining for the algorithm is enough to satisfy a high probability bound on the resources required to allocate \underline{X} to every individual arriving in the future. This idea is formalized in Section 7, and takes motivation in recent developments on Bayesian prophet benchmarks for online bin packing problems [48].

Algorithm Description

Let $B_{t,k}^{alg}$ denote the budget remaining to the principal for resource k at iteration t , i.e. $B_k - \sum_{t' < t} \sum_{\theta} N_{t',\theta} X_{t',\theta,k}$. Assume the algorithm is given the expected demands $(\mathbb{E}[N_\theta])_{\theta \in \Theta}$ and confidence terms $\text{CONF}_{t,\theta}$ such that $|N_{>t,\theta} - \mathbb{E}[N_{>t,\theta}]| \leq \text{CONF}_{t,\theta}$ with high probability. Let $\gamma = \max_{\theta} \frac{\text{CONF}_{0,\theta}}{\mathbb{E}[N_{\geq 1,\theta}]}$. Given a desired bound on envy L_T , the algorithm computes the guardrails by

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{X} &= x((\bar{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}) \text{ for } \bar{n}_\theta = \left(1 + \max_{\theta} \frac{\text{CONF}_\theta}{\mathbb{E}[N_\theta]}\right) \mathbb{E}[N_\theta] \\ \overline{X} &= x((\underline{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}) \text{ for } \underline{n}_\theta = (1 - c) \mathbb{E}[N_\theta] \\ \text{for } c &= \frac{\|w\|_{\min} \|\beta_{avg}\|_{\min}}{\|w\|_{\infty}^2} L_T \left(1 + \max_{\theta} \frac{\text{CONF}_\theta}{\mathbb{E}[N_\theta]}\right) - \max_{\theta} \frac{\text{CONF}_\theta}{\mathbb{E}[N_\theta]}. \end{aligned}$$

where $x(\cdot)$ denotes the solution to Eq. (3). Note that as long as $L_T \gtrsim \sqrt{\log(|\Theta|T/\delta)/T}$, the utility of the optimal allocation is sandwiched by the utilities of \underline{X} and \overline{X} according to Section 5.

Our algorithm allocates to type θ according to these thresholds \underline{X}_θ and \overline{X}_θ in order to ensure the guarantee of Δ_{EF} of at most L_T , while simultaneously trying to eliminate as much waste as possible. At each time t , for each resource $k \in [K]$,

1. If $B_{t,k}^{alg} \leq N_{t,\theta} \underline{X}_{\theta,k}$ then divide the resources equally among all remaining individuals for this round
2. If $B_{t,k}^{alg} \geq \overline{X}_{\theta,k} N_{t,\theta} + \underline{X}_{\theta,k} (\mathbb{E}[N_{>t,\theta}] + \text{CONF}_{t,\theta})$ then set $X_{t,\theta,k}^{alg} = \overline{X}_{\theta,k}$ for each $\theta \in \Theta$.
3. Otherwise set $X_{t,\theta,k}^{alg} = \underline{X}_{\theta,k}$ for each $\theta \in \Theta$.

Our algorithm is easy to implement in practice - in particular, it requires solving the Eisenberg-Gale program Eq. (3) *only twice* to obtain \underline{X} and \overline{X} . This allows the algorithm to scale easily to multiple resources and larger number of types (as it only involves solving for the ‘optimistic’ and ‘pessimistic’ allocation rules which are done offline with historical data). Moreover, it allows practitioners to leverage work on poly-time algorithms for solving the Eisenberg-Gale program [19]. It also extends easily to more complex information structures (as the algorithm only requires access to moments of $N_{t,\theta}$ and confidence terms, it is easy to extend the information structure to add additional side information).

7 Envy and Efficiency Bound for Guarded-Hope

We are now ready to show the bound on Δ_{EF} and $\Delta_{efficiency}$ for GUARDED-HOPE, relying on the concentration guarantees and construction of \overline{X}_θ and \underline{X}_θ from Section 5. We note that these

guarantees match the envy-efficiency uncertainty principle from Section 4 up to problem-dependent constants and logarithmic terms in T .

Theorem 7.1. *Given budget B , expected number of types $(\mathbb{E}[N_\theta])_{\theta \in \Theta}$, and confidence terms $(\text{CONF}_{t,\theta})_{\theta \in \Theta}$ such that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

1. $L_T \geq 2 \frac{\|w\|_\infty^2}{\|w\|_{\min} \|\beta_{\text{avg}}\|_{\min}} \max_{\theta} \frac{\text{CONF}_{\theta}}{\mathbb{E}[N_{\theta}]}$
2. $|N_{\geq t,\theta} - \mathbb{E}[N_{\geq t,\theta}]| \leq \text{CONF}_{t-1,\theta}$ for all $t \in [T]$, $\theta \in \Theta$

GUARDED-HOPE is able to achieve with probability at least $1 - \delta$ for some $c = \Theta(1)$,

$$\Delta_{EF} \leq L_T$$

$$\Delta_{\text{efficiency}} \leq L_T^{-1} (4 \|B\|_1 \rho_{\max} \sqrt{c \log(|\Theta| T / \delta)}).$$

Proof. Define the event $\mathcal{E} = \{\forall t \in [T], \forall \theta \in \Theta : |N_{\geq t,\theta} - \mathbb{E}[N_{\geq t,\theta}]| \leq \text{CONF}_{t-1,\theta}\}$. By assumption we know that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \geq 1 - \delta$. The following lemma shows the algorithm ensures it has enough budget to allocate according to the lower threshold for everyone arriving in the future.

Lemma 7.2. *Under the event \mathcal{E} , for every resource k and time $t \in [T]$ it follows that*

$$B_{t,k}^{\text{alg}} \geq \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_{\geq t,\theta} \underline{X}_{\theta,k}.$$

As a result, the algorithm is able to guarantee that at every iteration $X_{t,\theta,k}^{\text{alg}}$ is either $\bar{X}_{\theta,k}$ or $\underline{X}_{\theta,k}$.

Proof. We show the first statement by induction on t . The second statement follows immediately. **Base Case** $t = 1$. Here we have that $B_1^{\text{alg}} = B$ and by construction of \underline{X}_{θ} we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{1,k}^{\text{alg}} &\geq \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \bar{n}_{\theta} \underline{X}_{\theta,k} \text{ by feasibility} \\ &\geq \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_{\theta} \underline{X}_{\theta,k} \text{ by event } \mathcal{E}. \end{aligned}$$

Step Case $t - 1 \rightarrow t$. We split into two cases based on the allocation. If $X_{t-1,\theta,k}^{\text{alg}} = \underline{X}_{\theta,k}$, then by the induction hypothesis

$$B_{t,k}^{\text{alg}} = B_{t-1,k}^{\text{alg}} - \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_{t-1,\theta} \underline{X}_{\theta,k} \geq \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_{\geq t,\theta} \underline{X}_{\theta,k}.$$

If $X_{t-1,\theta,k}^{\text{alg}} = \bar{X}_{\theta,k}$, then

$$B_{t,k}^{\text{alg}} = B_{t-1,k}^{\text{alg}} - \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_{t-1,\theta} X_{t-1,\theta,k}^{\text{alg}} \stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \underline{X}_{\theta,k} (\mathbb{E}[N_{\geq t,\theta}] + \text{CONF}_{t-1,\theta}) \stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_{\geq t,\theta} \underline{X}_{\theta,k}.$$

where (a) holds by the condition for allocating $\bar{X}_{\theta,k}$, and (b) holds under event \mathcal{E} . \square

The next lemma shows that the algorithm is adaptively cautious, i.e., after some point, GUARDED-HOPE switches to allocating according to the lower threshold.

Lemma 7.3. *For each resource k , let $t_{0,k}$ be the last time that $X_{t,\theta,k}^{\text{alg}} \neq \bar{X}_{\theta,k}$ (or else 0 if the algorithm always allocates according to $\bar{X}_{\theta,k}$). Then under the event \mathcal{E} for some $c = \tilde{\Theta}(1)$ we have that for all k , $t_{0,k} \geq T - 2cL_T^{-2}$.*

Proof. First note that under the event \mathcal{E} , $t_{0,k}$ must be nonzero as it is impossible for the algorithm to have always allocated $\bar{X}_{\theta,k}$ for all time for any k (see Lemma 7.2).

We will show the result by contradiction. For some resource k , assume that $t_{0,k} < T - 2cL_T^{-2}$. By definition of $t_{0,k}$, it must be that the algorithm allocated $\underline{X}_{\theta,k}$ at time $t_{0,k}$ and allocated $\bar{X}_{\theta,k}$ for all subsequent times. Given the assumption, it must be that for any $t > t_{0,k}$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\theta} \underline{X}_{\theta,k} (\mathbb{E}[N_{>t,\theta}] + \text{CONF}_{t,\theta}) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} B_{t,k}^{alg} - \sum_{\theta} N_{t,\theta} \bar{X}_{\theta,k} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} B_{t_{0,k}}^{alg} - \sum_{\theta} \underline{X}_{\theta,k} N_{t_{0,k},\theta} - \sum_{\theta} \bar{X}_{\theta,k} \sum_{i=t_{0,k}+1}^t N_{i,\theta} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{<} \sum_{\theta} \underline{X}_{\theta,k} (\mathbb{E}[N_{>t_{0,k},\theta}] + \text{CONF}_{t_{0,k},\theta}) + \sum_{\theta} (\bar{X}_{\theta,k} - \underline{X}_{\theta,k}) N_{t_{0,k},\theta} - \sum_{\theta} \bar{X}_{\theta,k} \sum_{i=t_{0,k}+1}^t N_{i,\theta} \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the condition in the algorithm for $X_{t,\theta,k}^{alg} = \bar{X}_{\theta,k}$, (b) follows from the definition of $t_{0,k}$ and the choice of $t > t_{0,k}$, and (c) follows from the condition in the algorithm for $X_{t_{0,k},\theta,k}^{alg} = \underline{X}_{\theta,k}$. By rearranging the inequality we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\theta} \bar{X}_{\theta,k} N_{(t_{0,k},t],\theta} &< \sum_{\theta} (\bar{X}_{\theta,k} - \underline{X}_{\theta,k}) N_{t_{0,k},\theta} + \sum_{\theta} \underline{X}_{\theta,k} \mathbb{E}[N_{(t_{0,k},t],\theta}] + \sum_{\theta} \underline{X}_{\theta,k} (\text{CONF}_{t_{0,k},\theta} - \text{CONF}_{t,\theta}) \\ \iff \sum_{\theta} \bar{X}_{\theta,k} (N_{(t_{0,k},t],\theta} - \mathbb{E}[N_{(t_{0,k},t],\theta}]) &< \sum_{\theta} (\bar{X}_{\theta,k} - \underline{X}_{\theta,k}) (N_{t_{0,k},\theta} - \mathbb{E}[N_{(t_{0,k},t],\theta}]) \\ &+ \sum_{\theta} \underline{X}_{\theta,k} (\text{CONF}_{t_{0,k},\theta} - \text{CONF}_{t,\theta}). \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $\bar{X}_{\theta,k} - \underline{X}_{\theta,k} \leq L_T \frac{\|B\|_{\infty} \|\beta_{avg}\|_{min} \|w\|_{min}}{\|w\|_{\infty}}$, and plugging in an upper bound for the demand at time $t_{0,k}$, a lower bound on the expected demand, and the confidence terms from Lemma 5.3, the right hand side of the above inequality can be bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned} L_T \frac{\|B\|_{\infty} \|\beta_{avg}\|_{min} \|w\|_{min}}{\|w\|_{\infty}} |\Theta| (\rho_{max} + \mu_{max}) - L_T \frac{\|B\|_{\infty} \|\beta_{avg}\|_{min} \|w\|_{min}}{\|w\|_{\infty}} |\Theta| (t - t_{0,k}) \\ + \|B\|_{\infty} |\Theta| \sqrt{2\rho_{max}^2 \log(T|\Theta|/\delta)} (\sqrt{T - t_{0,k}} - \sqrt{T - t}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the left hand side can be bounded below under event \mathcal{E} via

$$\sum_{\theta} \bar{X}_{\theta,k} (N_{(t_{0,k},t],\theta} - \mathbb{E}[N_{(t_{0,k},t],\theta}]) \geq -\|\beta_{avg}\|_{\infty} \sqrt{2\rho_{max}^2 \log(T|\Theta|/\delta)} (t - t_{0,k}).$$

Plugging in the value of $t = T - cL_T^{-2}$ and by assumption that $t_{0,k} < T - 2cL_T^{-2}$, it follows that for $\xi = \sqrt{2\rho_{max}^2 \log(T|\Theta|/\delta)}$, $\zeta = \frac{\|B\|_{\infty} \|\beta_{avg}\|_{min} \|w\|_{min}}{\|w\|_{\infty}}$,

$$-\|\beta_{avg}\|_{\infty} \xi \sqrt{cL_T^{-2}} \leq L_T |\Theta| \zeta (\rho_{max} + \mu_{max}) - L_T |\Theta| \zeta cL_T^{-2} + \|B\|_{\infty} |\Theta| \xi \left(\sqrt{2cL_T^{-2}} - \sqrt{cL_T^{-2}} \right).$$

Relabeling $x = \sqrt{c}$ to show a contradiction we need to find a value of x such that

$$-\frac{a_1}{L_T} x^2 + \frac{a_2}{L_T} x + a_3 L_T \leq 0.$$

Noting that the cusp of the quadratic is at $\frac{a_2}{a_1}$ we see that taking the constant

$$c = \frac{\|B\|_\infty |\Theta| \xi (\sqrt{2} - 1) + \|\beta_{avg}\|_\infty \xi}{|\Theta| \zeta}$$

(independent of L_T) suffices to show the contradiction ($\Rightarrow \Leftarrow$). \square

The main result follows from the above two lemmas. By Lemma 7.2, the allocations made by the algorithm under the event \mathcal{E} lie within $[\underline{X}_\theta, \bar{X}_\theta]$. Thus by construction of \bar{X} and \underline{X} , it follows that $\Delta_{EF} = \|u(X_\theta^{opt}, \theta) - u(X_\theta^{alg}, \theta)\|_\infty \leq L_T$ via Theorem 5.2.

The upper bound on $\Delta_{efficiency}$ follows from Lemma 7.3, which states that if $t_{0,k}$ denotes the last time that $X_{t,\theta,k}^{alg} \neq \bar{X}_{\theta,k}$, then for all k , $t_{0,k} \geq T - 2cL_T^{-2}$ with high probability. This implies that for all k ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{efficiency} &= \sum_k \left(B_k - \sum_{t \in [T]} \sum_\theta X_{t,\theta,k}^{alg} N_{i,\theta} \right) = \sum_k \left(B_{t_{0,k}}^{alg} - \sum_{t \geq t_{0,k}} \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_{t,\theta} X_{t,\theta,k}^{alg} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_k B_{t_{0,k},k}^{alg} - \sum_\theta \left(\underline{X}_{\theta,k} N_{t_{0,k},\theta} + \sum_{t > t_{0,k}} \bar{X}_{\theta,k} N_{t,\theta} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{<} \sum_k \sum_\theta \left(\underline{X}_{\theta,k} (\mathbb{E}[N_{>t_{0,k},\theta}] + \text{CONF}_{t_{0,k},\theta} - N_{>t_{0,k},\theta}) - (\bar{X}_{\theta,k} - \underline{X}_{\theta,k})(N_{>t_{0,k},\theta} - N_{t_{0,k},\theta}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that by the definition of $t_{0,k}$ the algorithm allocated the lower allocation at time $t_{0,k}$ and the upper allocation for all $t > t_{0,k}$, and (b) follows from the condition in the algorithm for allocating the lower allocation at time $t_{0,k}$, which upper bounds $B_{t_{0,k},k}^{alg}$.

However, under \mathcal{E} we know that $\mathbb{E}[N_{>t_{0,k},\theta}] - N_{>t_{0,k},\theta} \leq 2\text{CONF}_{t_{0,k},\theta}$. Plugging in the definition of $\text{CONF}_{t_{0,k},\theta}$ and the bound on $(\bar{X}_{\theta,k} - \underline{X}_{\theta,k})$ from Theorem 5.2 we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{efficiency} &\leq 2 \sum_k \sum_\theta \underline{X}_{\theta,k} \text{CONF}_{t_{0,k},\theta} + N_{t_{0,k},\theta} (\bar{X}_{\theta,k} - \underline{X}_{\theta,k}) \\ &\leq 2\|B\|_1 \sum_k \sum_\theta \sqrt{2\rho_{max}^2 (T - t_{0,k}) \log(T|\Theta|/\delta)} + (\mu_{max} + \rho_{max}) \frac{2\|B\|_\infty \|\beta_{avg}\|_{min}^2 \|w\|_{min} \max_\theta \|w_\theta\|_1}{\|w\|_\infty} L_T \\ &\leq 2\|B\|_1 \sqrt{2\rho_{max}^2 \log(|\Theta|T/\delta) cL_T^{-2}} + (\mu_{max} + \rho_{max}) \frac{2\|B\|_\infty \|\beta_{avg}\|_{min}^2 \|w\|_{min} \max_\theta \|w_\theta\|_1}{\|w\|_\infty} L_T \\ &\leq L_T^{-1} (4\|B\|_1 \rho_{max} \sqrt{c \log(|\Theta|T/\delta)} + (\mu_{max} + \rho_{max}) \frac{2\|B\|_\infty \|\beta_{avg}\|_{min}^2 \|w\|_{min} \max_\theta \|w_\theta\|_1}{\|w\|_\infty} L_T^2) \end{aligned}$$

Note that $L_T^2 = o(1)$ such that the second term is dominated by the first. \square

While a guarantee on Δ_{EF} does not immediately guarantee a bound on ENVY or Δ_{prop} , we are able to show that GUARDED-HOPE is able to achieve ENVY, $\Delta_{prop} \lesssim L_T$. This arises due to the threshold allocations provisioned by the algorithm.

Theorem 7.4. *With probability at least $1 - \delta$, GUARDED-HOPE satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ENVY} &= \max_{t,\theta,t',\theta'} u(X_{t',\theta'}^{alg}, \theta) - u(X_{t,\theta}^{alg}, \theta) \leq \frac{2\|B\|_\infty \|\beta_{avg}\|_{min}^2 \|w\|_{min} \max_\theta \|w_\theta\|_1}{\|w\|_\infty} L_T \\ \Delta_{prop} &= \max_{t,\theta} u\left(\frac{B}{\sum_{t,\theta} N_{t,\theta}}, \theta\right) - u(X_{t,\theta}^{alg}, \theta) \leq L_T \end{aligned}$$




Figure 2: Map of the distribution locations serviced by the mobile-food pantry of the Food Bank of the Southern Tier of New York in 2019.

Proof. ENVY: Consider an arbitrary t, θ, t', θ' . Then we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
u(X_{t', \theta'}^{alg}, \theta) - u(X_{t, \theta}^{alg}, \theta) &= u(X_{t', \theta'}^{alg}, \theta) - u(\underline{X}_{\theta'}, \theta) + u(\underline{X}_{\theta'}, \theta) - u(\underline{X}_{\theta}, \theta) \\
&\quad + u(\underline{X}_{\theta}, \theta) - u(X_{t, \theta}^{alg}, \theta) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} u(X_{t', \theta'}^{alg}, \theta) - u(\underline{X}_{\theta'}, \theta) + u(\underline{X}_{\theta}, \theta) - u(X_{t, \theta}^{alg}, \theta) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \|w_{\theta'}\|_1 \|X_{t', \theta'}^{alg} - \underline{X}_{\theta'}\| + \|w_{\theta}\|_1 \|X_{t, \theta}^{alg} - \underline{X}_{\theta}\| \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 2 \max_{\theta} \|w_{\theta}\|_1 \|\bar{X} - \underline{X}\|_{\infty} \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \frac{2 \|B\|_{\infty} \|\beta_{avg}\|_{min}^2 \|w\|_{min} \max_{\theta} \|w_{\theta}\|_1}{\|w\|_{\infty}} L_T
\end{aligned}$$

Where in (a) we used that \underline{X} is envy free we know the second pair is bounded above by zero, (b) we used the definition of the utilities, and (c) the fact that the algorithm allocates according to guardrails, and (d) the bound in Theorem 5.2. Taking max over t, t', θ, θ' gives the result.

Δ_{prop} : Recall that GUARDED-HOPE satisfies that $\Delta_{envy} \leq L_T$. However, by definition of Δ_{envy} this ensures that for any round t and type θ that $|u(X_{t, \theta}^{alg}, \theta) - u(X_{\theta}^{opt}, \theta)| \leq L_T$. Using this and the fact that X^{opt} is proportional we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
u(\beta_{avg}, \theta) - u(X_{t, \theta}^{alg}, \theta) &= u(\beta_{avg}, \theta) - u(X_{\theta}^{opt}, \theta) + u(X_{\theta}^{opt}, \theta) - u(X_{t, \theta}^{alg}, \theta) \\
&\leq L_T.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the max over t and θ gives the desired bound on Δ_{prop} . \square

8 Numerical Results

Here we complement the theoretical developments on the performance of GUARDED-HOPE with a case study motivated by the challenges faced by the Food Bank of the Southern Tier when operating their mobile food pantry program. We first describe the synthetic and data-driven experiments conducted and which aspects of the problem faced by the FBST they model, before later comparing the effectiveness of GUARDED-HOPE (with various choices of L_T) to other algorithms

on our established metrics (Definition 3.4). All of the code for the experiments is available at <https://github.com/seanrsinclair/Online-Resource-Allocation>.

8.1 Background

Our experiments are motivated by the problems faced by the Food Bank of the Southern Tier (FBST) on operating their mobile food pantry program. Due to recent increase in demands for food assistance from the COVID-19 epidemic in the United States [31] and sanctions on operating in-person stores, many food banks have increased their mobile food pantry services to meet the increased demand. In these systems, the mobile food pantry must decide on how much food to allocate to a distribution center on arrival, without knowledge of demands in future locations.

To be more specific, the FBST operates out of seventy different distribution locations (see Fig. 2 for a map) across the Southern Tier of New York State. Due to its relatively remote location, throughout the year they receive infrequent shipments of a large amount of resources. While they receive more frequent donations from individuals, the time between larger consistent donations can span up to two or three weeks. A certain amount of these resources are dedicated to the mobile food pantry, and used to service the seventy different distribution locations until the arrival of the next shipment. Moreover, the schedule to which the mobile food pantry visits the different distribution locations is fixed and known in advance (and is generated primarily due to time constraints in the locations used for the distribution locations).

We interpret the total number of rounds T as the number of distribution locations the mobile food pantry will visit until the arrival of the next shipment of food resources. Important to note, is that in our simulation experiments we do not consider the additional challenges faced when trying to design a schedule (i.e. an order to visit the distribution locations) so as to achieve further notions of fairness and equity. Each round t then corresponds to a visit to a specific distribution location (for example the Tompkins County Community College in Dryden, NY) where the food pantry decides on an allocation of resources to allocate to the (random) number of individuals congregating at that location.

As such, we conduct four experiments, named **Single-Synthetic**, **Single-FBST**, **Multi-Synthetic** and **Multi-FBST** where the distributions \mathcal{F}_t dictating the number of people of each type at a distribution location, and preferences $w_\theta \in \mathbb{R}^K$ are chosen as follows:

- **Single-Synthetic:** In this experiment we consider a single resource and single type, where the preference $w = 1$ (much like the simulation described in the lower bounds presented in Section 4) results in $u(X, \theta) = X$. We pick the arrival distribution $\mathcal{F}_t \sim \text{Poisson}(1.5)$.
- **Single-FBST:** Similar to **Single-Synthetic** we consider a single resource and single type, with preference $w = 1$. However, we model the arrival distribution $\mathcal{F}_t \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_t, \sigma_t^2)$ where μ and σ^2 are the mean and variance of a random collection of T locations taken from the 2019 historical dataset collected by the FBST.
- **Multi-Synthetic:** In this experiment we consider the setting of five types and three resources. The weights w_θ for the different types θ are listed in Table 3. The arrival distribution is chosen to be $\mathcal{F}_t \sim \text{Poisson}(1.5, 2.5, 3.5, 4.5, 5.5)$.
- **Multi-FBST:** Here we consider the setting of five resources (corresponding to cereal, pasta, prepared meals, rice, and meat) and three types (corresponding to vegetarians, carnivores, and “prepared-food only” individuals). We model the arrival distribution $\mathcal{F}_t \sim D_\theta \text{Normal}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ where μ and σ^2 are the mean and variance of a random collection of T locations taken from the 2019 historical dataset collected by the FBST, and $D_\theta = [.25, .3, .45]$ corresponds to the

fraction of the population with each of those preferences. The weights w_θ for the products are chosen from the historical prices used in the market mechanism to distribute food resources to food pantries across the United States [40] (see Table 2 for the full table of weights).

For each of the experiments, we compare the performance of GUARDED-HOPE with $L_T = T^{1/2}$ and $T^{1/3}$ to a FIXED-THRESHOLD algorithm which always allocates according to \underline{X} until running out of resources.

We believe that these experiments both help highlight the theoretical performance of GUARDED-HOPE, while simultaneously serving as an example of the practicality of our algorithm for broader stockpile allocation problems.

8.2 Simulation Results

For the setups described above, we numerically evaluate the performance of various policies. In each simulation we set the total budget B to be $\sum_{t,\theta} \mathbb{E}[N_{t,\theta}]$ so that the scaling of β_{avg} remains as a constant as we vary the number of rounds T .

- $\Delta_{EF} = \|u(X_{t,\theta}^{opt}, \theta) - u(X_{t,\theta}^{alg}, \theta)\|_\infty$, the maximum difference between utility individuals receive for the two allocations as we scale the number of rounds T (Definition 3.4)
- $\Delta_{efficiency} = \sum_k B_k - \sum_{t,\theta} N_{t,\theta} X_{t,\theta,k}^{alg}$, the leftover resources as we scale the number of rounds T (Definition 3.4)
- $\Delta_{EF}^+ = \max_{t,\theta} \mathbb{E} \left[|u(X_{t,\theta}^{opt}, \theta) - u(X_{t,\theta}^{alg}, \theta)| \right]$, the ex-ante maximum difference between utility individuals receive for the two allocations as we scale the number of rounds T
- $ENVY = \max_{t,\theta,t',\theta'} u(X_{t',\theta'}^{alg}, \theta) - u(X_{t,\theta}^{alg}, \theta)$, the maximum hindsight envy between any two agents (Definition 3.5)
- $\Delta_{prop} = \max_{t,\theta} u(B/N, \theta) - u(X_{t,\theta}^{alg}, \theta)$, the maximum hindsight envy between an agent and equal allocation (Definition 3.5)

For each of the simulations conducted we include two plots (as seen in Figs. 3 and 4). The first of which highlights the measure of Δ_{EF} , $\Delta_{efficiency}$ and Δ_{EF}^+ as we vary the number of rounds T . The second fixes a value of T and compares the algorithms on each of the six metrics, where the values are normalized and larger scores corresponds to better performance. We make three key observations:

1. **Fixed-Threshold vs Guarded-Hope:** In Fig. 3 we see that our GUARDED-HOPE algorithms (for varying values of L_T) are able to outperform FIXED-THRESHOLD in terms of efficiency, as our algorithms greedily allocate the upper threshold while ensuring budget compliance.
2. **Guarded-Hope for varying L_T :** In Fig. 3 we see that GUARDED-HOPE for larger values of L_T achieves better efficiency performance, but worse performance in terms of Δ_{EF} (and illustrating Theorem 7.1).
3. **Multi-Objective Radar Plots:** In Fig. 4 we compare each of the algorithms on several different metrics. Here we see that GUARDED-HOPE performs competitively with respect to FIXED-THRESHOLD on the metrics of interest (in particular, Δ_{EF} and $\Delta_{efficiency}$), with the ability to tune the performance by varying the parameter L_T .







Figure 3: Comparison of GUARDED-HOPE for $L_T = T^{1/2}$ and $L_T = T^{1/3}$ to FIXED THRESHOLD on the four simulation settings as we vary the number of rounds T . In each of the simulations we observe that GUARDED-HOPE is able to outperform a FIXED THRESHOLD algorithm in terms of $\Delta_{efficiency}$, while GUARDED-HOPE simultaneously achieves various trade-offs between Δ_{EF} and $\Delta_{efficiency}$ as we vary L_T .




(a) **Single-Synthetic**



(b) **Single-FBST**



(c) **Multi-Synthetic**



(d) **Multi-FBST**



(e) Legend

Figure 4: Comparison of GUARDED-HOPE for $L_T = T^{1/2}$ and $L_T = T^{1/3}$ to FIXED THRESHOLD on the four simulation settings as we vary the number of rounds T on six metrics. The values here are normalized to be between $[0, 1]$ to better highlight the performance of the algorithms, where larger values correspond to better performance.

These simulations help illustrate the theoretical performance of GUARDED-HOPE (as outlined in Theorem 7.1) and the Envy-Efficiency Uncertainty Principle (as in Theorem 4.2). Moreover, they help illustrate the truly multi-objective landscape of determining a fair allocation algorithm, and the benefits of varying GUARDED-HOPE to tune L_T and achieve a desired performance across all of the benchmarks.

9 Conclusion

In this paper we considered the problem of dividing limited resources to individuals arriving over T rounds, where each round can be thought of a distribution location. In the offline setting (where the number of individuals arriving to each location is known), achieving a fair allocation scheme is found by maximizing the Nash Social Welfare objective subject to budget constraints. However, in online settings, no online algorithm can achieve fairness properties ex-post. We instead consider the objective of minimizing Δ_{EF} (the maximum difference between the utility individuals receive from the allocation made by the algorithm and the counterfactual optimal fair allocation in hindsight) and $\Delta_{efficiency}$ (the additive excess of resources).

However, we show that this objective leads to a the envy-efficiency uncertainty principle, an exact characterization between the achievable $(\Delta_{EF}, \Delta_{efficiency})$ pairs. In particular, our result shows that any algorithm which achieves a guarantee of $\Delta_{EF} \lesssim L_T$ must necessarily suffer $\Delta_{efficiency} \gtrsim \frac{1}{L_T}$. With this analysis, we show that it leads to a simple algorithm, GUARDED-HOPE, which is obtained by solving the Eisenberg-Gale program with unknown quantities replaced with their expectation to generate *guardrails* used in the allocation, combined with an adaptive algorithm aimed at minimizing waste. Through experiments we showed that GUARDED-HOPE is able to obtain allocations which achieve any fairness - efficiency tradeoff, with desirable fairness properties compared to several benchmarks and prior work.

Several open questions remain, including extending the analysis to more general utility functions (including homothetic, another common model of preferences over resources). We also believe much of the theoretical results apply to settings where the budget B is instead a stochastic process, accounting for external donations and depletions of the resources independent of the allocations made by the algorithm. Moreover, we leave the question of matching the upper and lower bounds in terms of problem dependent constants, and the issue of determining the *schedule* to visit locations as future work.

Acknowledgements

Part of this work was done while Sean Sinclair and Christina Yu were visiting the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing for the semester on the Theory of Reinforcement Learning. We also gratefully acknowledge funding from the NSF under grants ECCS-1847393, DMS-1839346, CCF-1948256, and CNS-1955997, and the ARL under grant W911NF-17-1-0094. We would also like to thank the Food Bank of the Southern Tier and the Cornell Mathematical Contest in Modeling for their collaboration.

References

- [1] Rediet Abebe, Solon Barocas, Jon Kleinberg, Karen Levy, Manish Raghavan, and David G Robinson. Roles for computing in social change. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 252–260, 2020.
- [2] Martin Aleksandrov and Toby Walsh. Monotone and online fair division. In *Joint German/Austrian Conference on Artificial Intelligence (Künstliche Intelligenz)*, pages 60–75. Springer, 2019.
- [3] Martin Aleksandrov and Toby Walsh. Online fair division: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.09488*, 2019.
- [4] Martin Damyanov Aleksandrov, Haris Aziz, Serge Gaspers, and Toby Walsh. Online fair division: Analysing a food bank problem. In *Twenty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2015.
- [5] Faisal Alkaabneh, Ali Diabat, and Huaizhu Oliver Gao. A unified framework for efficient, effective, and fair resource allocation by food banks using an approximate dynamic programming approach. *Omega*, page 102300, 2020.
- [6] Kenneth J Arrow. *Social choice and individual values*, volume 12. Yale university press, 2012.
- [7] Yossi Azar, Niv Buchbinder, and Kamal Jain. How to allocate goods in an online market? In *European Symposium on Algorithms*, pages 51–62. Springer, 2010.
- [8] Haris Aziz, Ildikó Anna Schlotter, and Toby Walsh. Control of fair division. *IJCAI*, 2016.
- [9] Siddhartha Banerjee, Vasilis Gkatzelis, Artur Gorokh, and Billy Jin. Online nash social welfare maximization via promised utilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.03564*, 2020.
- [10] Nikhil Bansal, Haotian Jiang, Sahil Singla, and Makrand Sinha. Online vector balancing and geometric discrepancy. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1139–1152, 2020.
- [11] Mohammad Hossein Bateni, Yiwei Chen, Dragos Ciocan, and Vahab Mirrokni. Fair resource allocation in a volatile marketplace. *Available at SSRN 2789380*, 2018.
- [12] Lauren Bauer. About 14 million children in the us are not getting enough to eat. *Brookings*, Jul 2020.
- [13] Gerdus Benade, Aleksandr M Kazachkov, Ariel D Procaccia, and Christos-Alexandros Psomas. How to make envy vanish over time. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 593–610, 2018.
- [14] Andrew C Berry. The accuracy of the gaussian approximation to the sum of independent variates. *Transactions of the american mathematical society*, 49(1):122–136, 1941.
- [15] Anna Bogomolnaia and Hervé Moulin. A new solution to the random assignment problem. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 100(2):295–328, 2001.
- [16] Anna Bogomolnaia, Hervé Moulin, and Fedor Sandomirskiy. On the fair division of a random object. *Management Science*, 2021.

- [17] Steven J Brams and Alan D Taylor. An envy-free cake division protocol. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 102(1):9–18, 1995.
- [18] Steven J Brams and Alan D Taylor. *Fair Division: From cake-cutting to dispute resolution*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [19] Nikhil R Devanur, Christos H Papadimitriou, Amin Saberi, and Vijay V Vazirani. Market equilibrium via a primal-dual-type algorithm. In *The 43rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2002. Proceedings.*, pages 389–395. IEEE, 2002.
- [20] Kate Donahue and Jon Kleinberg. Fairness and utilization in allocating resources with uncertain demand. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 658–668, 2020.
- [21] Edmund Eisenberg. Aggregation of utility functions. *Management Science*, 7(4):337–350, 1961.
- [22] Ohad Eisenhandler and Michal Tzur. The humanitarian pickup and distribution problem. *Operations Research*, 67(1):10–32, 2019.
- [23] Hadi Elzayn, Shahin Jabbari, Christopher Jung, Michael Kearns, Seth Neel, Aaron Roth, and Zachary Schutzman. Fair algorithms for learning in allocation problems. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 170–179, 2019.
- [24] Food Bank of the Southern Tier of New York. <https://www.foodbankst.org/>, 2020.
- [25] Enrico Gerding, Alvaro Perez-Diaz, Haris Aziz, Serge Gaspers, Antonia Marcu, Nicholas Mattei, and Toby Walsh. Fair online allocation of perishable goods and its application to electric vehicle charging. 2019.
- [26] Ali Ghodsi, Matei Zaharia, Benjamin Hindman, Andy Konwinski, Scott Shenker, and Ion Stoica. Dominant resource fairness: Fair allocation of multiple resource types. In *Nsdi*, volume 11, pages 24–24, 2011.
- [27] Jiafan He, Ariel D. Procaccia, Alexandros Psomas, and David Zeng. Achieving a fairer future by changing the past. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-19*, pages 343–349. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 7 2019.
- [28] Majid Jaber-Douraki and Seyed M Moghadas. Optimal control of vaccination dynamics during an influenza epidemic. *Mathematical Biosciences & Engineering*, 11(5):1045, 2014.
- [29] Thomas Kalinowski, Nina Narodytska, and Toby Walsh. A social welfare optimal sequential allocation procedure. In *Twenty-Third International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2013.
- [30] Ian Kash, Ariel D Procaccia, and Nisarg Shah. No agent left behind: Dynamic fair division of multiple resources. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 51:579–603, 2014.
- [31] Nicholas Kulish. 'never seen anything like it': Cars line up for miles at food banks, Apr 2020.
- [32] Robert W Lien, Seyed MR Iravani, and Karen R Smilowitz. Sequential resource allocation for nonprofit operations. *Operations Research*, 62(2):301–317, 2014.

- [33] Sydney Lupkin. How feds decide on remdesivir shipments to states remains mysterious, Aug 2020.
- [34] Vahideh Manshadi, Rad Niazadeh, and Scott Rodilitz. Fair dynamic rationing. *Available at SSRN 3775895*, 2021.
- [35] Nicholas Mattei, Abdallah Saffidine, and Toby Walsh. Mechanisms for online organ matching. In *IJCAI*, pages 345–351, 2017.
- [36] Nicholas Mattei, Abdallah Saffidine, and Toby Walsh. Fairness in deceased organ matching. In *Proceedings of the 2018 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pages 236–242, 2018.
- [37] Hervé Moulin. *Fair division and collective welfare*. MIT press, 2004.
- [38] Noam Nisan, Tim Roughgarden, Éva Tardos, and Vijay V. Vazirani, editors. *Algorithmic Game Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [39] Irem Sengul Orgut, Luther G Brock III, Lauren Berrings Davis, Julie Simmons Ivy, Steven Jiang, Shona D Morgan, Reha Uzsoy, Charlie Hale, and Earline Middleton. Achieving equity, effectiveness, and efficiency in food bank operations: Strategies for feeding america with implications for global hunger relief. In *Advances in managing humanitarian operations*, pages 229–256. Springer, 2016.
- [40] Canice Prendergast. How food banks use markets to feed the poor. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31(4):145–62, 2017.
- [41] Ariel D Procaccia. Cake cutting: not just child’s play. *Communications of the ACM*, 56(7):78–87, 2013.
- [42] Irem Sengul Orgut, Julie Ivy, and Reha Uzsoy. Modeling for the equitable and effective distribution of food donations under stochastic receiving capacities. *IISE Transactions*, 49(6):567–578, 2017.
- [43] Efrat Shadmi, Yingyao Chen, Inês Dourado, Inbal Faran-Perach, John Furler, Peter Hangoma, Piya Hanvoravongchai, Claudia Obando, Varduhi Petrosyan, Krishna D Rao, et al. Health equity and covid-19: global perspectives. *International journal for equity in health*, 19(1):1–16, 2020.
- [44] Sean R. Sinclair, Gauri Jain, Siddhartha Banerjee, and Christina Lee Yu. Sequential fair allocation of limited resources under stochastic demands, 2020.
- [45] Robert Sugden. Is fairness good? a critique of varian’s theory of fairness. *Nous*, pages 505–511, 1984.
- [46] Hal R. Varian. Equity, envy, and efficiency. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 9(1):63–91, September 1974.
- [47] Hal R Varian. Two problems in the theory of fairness. *Journal of Public Economics*, 5(3-4):249–260, 1976.
- [48] Alberto Vera and Siddhartha Banerjee. The bayesian prophet: A low-regret framework for online decision making. *ACM SIGMETRICS Performance Evaluation Review*, 47(1):81–82, 2019.

- [49] Toby Walsh. Online cake cutting. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Decision Theory*, pages 292–305. Springer, 2011.
- [50] Ming Yi and Achla Marathe. Fairness versus efficiency of vaccine allocation strategies. *Value in Health*, 18(2):278–283, 2015.
- [51] David Zeng and Alexandros Psomas. Fairness-efficiency tradeoffs in dynamic fair division. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11672*, 2019.

A Table of Notation

Symbol	Definition
Problem setting specifications	
K	Number of resources
Θ	Set of types for individuals
T	Total number of rounds
B_k	Budget for resource $k \in [K]$
θ	Specification of an individual's type in Θ
$u(x, \theta) : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$	Utility function for individuals of type θ , here assumed to be $\langle x, \theta \rangle$
$N_{t,\theta}$	Number of individuals of type θ in round t
\mathcal{F}_t	Known distribution over $(N_{t,\theta})_{\theta \in \Theta}$
$N_{\geq t, \theta}$	$\sum_{t' \geq t} N_{t', \theta}$
N_θ	$\sum_{t' \geq 1} N_{t', \theta}$
$\sigma_{t,\theta}$	$\text{Var}[N_{t,\theta}]$
$\rho_{t,\theta}$	Bound on $ N_{t,\theta} - \mathbb{E}[N_{t,\theta}] \leq \rho_{t,\theta}$
$\mu_{t,\theta}$	$\mathbb{E}[N_{t,\theta}]$
$\sigma_{min}^2, \sigma_{max}^2, \rho_{min}, \rho_{max}, \mu_{min}, \mu_{max}$	The respective maximum and minimum value of each quantity
β_{avg}	$\sum_k B_k / \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}[N_\theta]$
X^{opt}, X^{alg}	Optimal fair allocation in hindsight, i.e. solves Eq. (3) and allocation by algorithm
Δ_{EF}	$\max_{t \in [T], \theta \in \Theta} \ u(X_{t,\theta}^{alg}, \theta) - u(X_{t,\theta}^{opt}, \theta)\ _\infty$
$\Delta_{efficiency}$	$\sum_k B_k - \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \sum_t N_{t,\theta} X_{t,\theta,k}^{alg}$
Algorithm specification	
B_t^{alg}	Budget available to the algorithm at start of round t , i.e. $B - \sum_{t' < t} \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_{t',\theta} X_{t',\theta}^{alg}$
τ	Stopping time to switch to conservative policy
$\text{CONF}_{t,\theta}$	Confidence bound on $N_{>t,\theta}$
γ	Multiplicative confidence bound, i.e. $\max_\theta \frac{\text{CONF}_{0,\theta}}{\mathbb{E}[N_{\geq 1,\theta}]}$
$\bar{n}_\theta, \underline{n}_\theta$	$\mathbb{E}[N_\theta](1 + \gamma), \mathbb{E}[N_\theta](1 - c)$
$\bar{X}_\theta, \underline{X}_\theta$	Optimistic and pesimistic solutions to Eq. (3) for \underline{n}_θ and \bar{n}_θ respectively
\mathcal{E}	'Good event' set, where the concentration inequalities hold
L_T	Desired bound on Δ_{EF}
Additional notation used for theory	
$\Phi(\cdot)$	Standard normal CDF
$\bar{\rho}_\theta, \bar{\sigma}_\theta^2, \bar{\mu}_\theta$	Averages of these quantities, i.e. $\frac{1}{T} \sum_t \rho_{t,\theta}, \frac{1}{T} \sum_t \sigma_{t,\theta}^2, \frac{1}{T} \sum_t \mathbb{E}[N_{t,\theta}]$

Table 1: List of common notation

B Discussion on Varian’s Fairness

In this section we discuss some of the limitations of our definitions as well as comparisons to competitive ratio guarantees. We note that these results have been presented at various workshops [44].

B.1 Limitation of Fair Allocations

Economists, computer scientists, and people in the operations research literature have become increasingly interested in questions of fairness [45, 46, 47]. One particular concept of fairness which has gained wide circulation due to its ease in compatibility is the so-called notion of ‘Varian fairness’ pioneered by Hal Varian in the 1970s taken in Definition 3.1. This theory of fairness provides three criteria for judging a given allocation of resources: *envy-freeness*, *Pareto-efficiency*, and *proportionality*, all defined with respect to utilities an individual has for different allocations. These criteria serve as more of a classification than an optimization perspective, as each of them merely provides a true/false criteria for an allocation to *satisfy* fairness rather than a way an allocation can *approach* fairness. Numerous other researchers have proposed other definitions of fairness, including α -fairness obtained by instead maximizing [37, 6]:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \text{sign}(\alpha) u(X_i, \theta_i)^\alpha.$$

In this definition, taking $\alpha = 1$ recovers utilitarian welfare, or maximizing the sum of utilities. Taking $\alpha \rightarrow -\infty$ also recovers the leximin objective, and $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ the leximax objective.

One primary critique of ‘Varian fairness’ is that a Varian fair allocation may not exist at all. Moreover, the implication is that *if* a Varian-fair allocation exists, then it has special merit. While we specifically consider settings where a ‘Varian fair’ allocation always exists (and is remarkably found as a result of optimizing the Nash Social Welfare objective), it is important to consider some of the several downsides of this model.

Comparison of Individuals: Paramount to Varian’s definition of proportionality and envy-freeness is that each individual is treated symmetrically. This ignores systemic factors that inhibit particular individual’s access to the resource.

Scale Invariance: The concept of fairness is strictly operational, in the sense that it requires no more information than what is contained in an individual’s utility function. Settings like matching students to local schools via school choice require definitions which measure the ‘utility of replacement’ [1]. As an example, a student with preferences (School A, School B, School C) in descending order gets matched to School B. How can we measure the overall gain to society when the student is instead matched to School A, or School C in comparison to another students list of preferences? In Varian’s definition of fairness, utility functions are only used to exhibit an ordering on preferences, rather than a relative value on different outcomes.

We believe the settings considered in Section 1.2 are well suited to Varian’s model on fairness. In the example motivated with the Food Bank of the Southern Tier of New York, rounds correspond to distribution sites, whether that be a soup kitchen, a drop-off location for the mobile food bank, etc. In these settings, individuals have use for all resources with strictly increasing utility with respect to the resource allocated. This motivates using scale invariant measures, as every individual will be able to use all available food allocated to them. Considering processor assignment in cloud computing platforms, each individual request coming in should be treated independently and symmetrically.

B.2 Competitive Ratio or Individual Guarantees

One approach on obtaining fairness guarantees for an online algorithm could be in the form of a competitive ratio. These results find allocation algorithms X^{alg} to which you can construct a bound on the competitive ratio for the Nash Social Welfare (or its logarithm):

$$\frac{\prod_{\theta} u(X_{\theta}^{alg}, \theta)^{N_{\theta}}}{\prod_{\theta} u(X_{\theta}^{opt}, \theta)^{N_{\theta}}} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\sum_{\theta} N_{\theta} \log(u(X_{\theta}^{alg}, \theta))}{\sum_{\theta} N_{\theta} \log(u(X_{\theta}^{opt}, \theta))}.$$

While theoretically interesting, these results provide no immediate individual fairness guarantees. The motivation for the Eisenberg-Gale program arises from the fact that *fairness is a byproduct*. To some extent, the actual objective value of an allocation is meaningless, and the objective is only taken as it serves as a proxy to obtain fair allocations. In many applications of resource allocation, stakeholders are more interested in obtaining individualized guarantees than global guarantees on social welfare. This motivated our alternative approach of designing algorithms with individualized guarantees in mind.

C Experiment Details

Table 2: Weights w_k for the different products considered in the **Multi-FBST** experiments. Here we use the weights taken from the historical prices used in the market mechanism to distribute food resources to food pantries across the United States [40].

Resource	Cereal	Pasta	Prepared Meals	Rice	Meat
Weights (carnivore)	3.9	3	2.8	2.7	1.9
Weights (vegetarian)	3.9	3	.1	2.7	.1
Weights (prepared-only)	3.9	3	2.8	2.7	.1

Table 3: Weights w_k for the different products considered for the **Multi-Synthetic** experiments.

Resource	$k = 1$	$k = 2$	$k = 3$
Weights $\theta = 1$	1	2	3
Weights $\theta = 2$	1	3	2
Weights $\theta = 3$	4	1	5
Weights $\theta = 4$	1	2	.5
Weights $\theta = 5$	3	7	5

Metrics Included: In the line plots we include three plots of the following:

- $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{EF}] = \mathbb{E}\left[\|u(X_{t,\theta}^{opt}, \theta) - u(X_{t,\theta}^{alg}, \theta)\|_{\infty}\right]$, the expected maximum difference between utility individuals receive for the two allocations as we scale the number of rounds T (Definition 3.4)
- $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{efficiency}] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_k B_k - \sum_{\theta,t} N_{t,\theta} X_{t,\theta,k}^{alg}\right]$, the expected leftover resources as we scale the number of rounds T (Definition 3.4)

- $\Delta_{EF}^+ = \max_{t,\theta} \mathbb{E} \left[|u(X_{t,\theta}^{opt}, \theta) - u(X_{t,\theta}^{alg}, \theta)| \right]$, the ex-ante maximum difference between utility individuals receive for the two allocations as we scale the number of rounds T

In the radar plots we additionally include:

- $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{EF}] = \mathbb{E} \left[\|u(X_{t,\theta}^{opt}, \theta) - u(X_{t,\theta}^{alg}, \theta)\|_\infty \right]$, the expected maximum difference between utility individuals receive for the two allocations (Definition 3.4)
- $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{efficiency}] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_k B_k - \sum_{\theta,t} N_{t,\theta} X_{t,\theta,k}^{alg} \right]$, the expected leftover resources (Definition 3.4)
- $\mathbb{E}[\text{ENVY}]$, the expected maximum envy between any two agents (Definition 3.5)
- $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_{prop}]$, the expected maximum envy between an agent and equal allocation (Definition 3.5)

Experiment Setup: Each experiment was run with 200 iterations where the relevant plots are taking the mean of the related quantities. In all experiments the budget $B = \sum_{t,\theta} \mathbb{E}[N_{t,\theta}]$ so that β_{avg} scales as a constant as we vary the number of rounds T . All randomness is dictated by a seed set at the start of each simulation for verifying results.

Computing Infrastructure: The experiments were conducted on a personal computer with an AMD Ryzen 5 3600 6-Core 3.60 GHz processor and 16.0GB of RAM. No GPUs were harmed in these experiments.

D Omitted Proofs

We start by giving a full proof for the Lipschitz properties of the optimal solution to the Eisenberg Gale program.

Lemma D.1 (Sensitivity of solutions to the Eisenberg-Gale Program (Lemma 5.1 of main paper)). *Let $x((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}), p((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$ denote the optimal primal and dual solution to the Eisenberg-Gale program (Eq. (3)) for a given vector of individuals of each type $(N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$. Then we have that:*

1. *Scaling: If $\tilde{N}_\theta = (1 + \zeta)N_\theta$ for every $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\zeta > 0$ then we have that:*

$$\begin{aligned} x((\tilde{N}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}) &= \frac{x((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})}{1 + \zeta} \\ p((\tilde{N}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}) &= (1 + \zeta)p((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have that

$$u(X((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})_\theta, \theta) - u(X((\tilde{N}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})_\theta, \theta) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + \zeta}\right) \max_k \frac{w_{\theta,k}}{p((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})_k}.$$

2. *Monotonicity: If $N_\theta \leq \tilde{N}_\theta$ for every $\theta \in \Theta$ then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} p((\tilde{N}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}) &\geq p((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}) \\ u(X((\tilde{N}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})_\theta, \theta) &\leq u(X((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})_\theta, \theta) \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For notational brevity we will use $x = x((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}), p = p((N_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$ and \tilde{x}, \tilde{p} for the solutions corresponding to N_θ and \tilde{N}_θ respectively. We start off by taking the KKT conditions of the Eisenberg-Gale program. Using variables p_k for the constraint that $\sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_\theta X_{\theta,k} \leq B_k$ we have the following conditions:

1. *Primal Feasibility*: $\sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_\theta X_{\theta,k} \leq B_k$
2. *Dual Feasibility*: $p_k \geq 0$
3. *Complementary Slackness*: $p_k > 0$ implies that $\sum_{\theta \in \Theta} N_\theta X_{\theta,k} = B_k$
4. *Gradient Condition*: For every θ and k ,

$$\frac{w_{\theta,k}}{p_k} \leq \langle w_\theta, X_\theta \rangle$$

with equality whenever $X_{\theta,k} > 0$.

Scaling: Suppose that $\tilde{N}_\theta = (1 + \zeta)N_\theta$ for every $\theta \in \Theta$.

Set $\tilde{p}_k = (1 + \zeta)p_k$ for each resource $k \in [K]$ and $\tilde{x}_{\theta,k} = x_{\theta,k}/(1 + \zeta)$. Verifying the KKT conditions for the prices and solutions \tilde{p} and \tilde{x} verifies that these are in fact the optimal primal and dual variables assuming that p and x are. To show the last property we note that

$$\begin{aligned} u(x_\theta, \theta) - u(\tilde{x}_\theta, \theta) &= \max_k \frac{w_{\theta,k}}{p_k} - \max_k \frac{w_{\theta,k}}{\tilde{p}_k} \\ &= \max_k \frac{w_{\theta,k}}{p_k} - \max_k \frac{w_{\theta,k}}{(1 + \zeta)p_k} \text{ via Scaling} \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + \zeta}\right) \max_k \frac{w_{\theta,k}}{p_k} \end{aligned}$$

Monotonicity: Suppose that $N_\theta \leq \tilde{N}_\theta$ for every $\theta \in \Theta$.

To show monotonicity with respect to the dual prices we use the tâtonnement algorithm developed in [38] to solve the Eisenberg-Gale program. At a high level, the algorithm starts off with initial prices p_k^0 for $k \in [K]$ which satisfy a *tight set* invariant (found by representing the allocations made via a network flow graph between resources and types). The tight set invariant is defined as:

$$\forall S \subset [K] : \sum_{k \in S} p_k \leq \sum_{\theta \in \Gamma(S,p)} N_\theta$$

where

$$\Gamma(S,p) = \left\{ \theta \in \Theta \mid \exists k \in S \text{ with } k \in \arg \min_{k' \in [K]} \frac{w_{\theta,k'}}{p_{k'}} \right\}.$$

The algorithm then raises the prices p_k^0 until all of the types have no surplus money.

As such, consider initializing the algorithm to solve for the dual prices \tilde{p} with the prices p . To show monotonicity with respect for the dual prices it suffices to show that the prices p satisfy the *tight set* invariant when the number of individuals of each type is \tilde{N}_θ . However, this is trivially true due to the optimality of the prices p (as they must satisfy the tight set invariant with respect to N_θ). Indeed, for any $S \subset [K]$ we must have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in S} p_k &\leq \sum_{\theta \in \Gamma(S,p)} N_\theta \text{ by optimality of the prices } p \\ &\leq \sum_{\theta \in \Gamma(S,p)} \tilde{N}_\theta \text{ by assumption.} \end{aligned}$$

As a result we see that the prices p_k satisfy the invariant and can serve as an initialization to the algorithm. As the algorithm only increases the prices until reaching optimality, it gives us that $p_k \leq \tilde{p}_k$ for every $k \in [K]$.

With this result we are able to show the monotonicity guarantee with respect to the utilities as:

$$u(x_\theta, \theta) = \max_k \frac{w_{\theta,k}}{p_k} \geq \max_k \frac{w_{\theta,k}}{\tilde{p}_k} = u(\tilde{x}_\theta, \theta).$$

□

Lemma D.2. *Suppose that $\underline{n}_\theta \leq N_\theta \leq \bar{n}_\theta$ and $\bar{X} = x((\underline{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$ and $\underline{X} = x((\bar{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$. Then we have that:*

1. $p((\underline{n}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}) \geq \frac{\|w\|_{\min} \|\beta_{avg}\|_{\min}}{\|w\|_{\infty}}$
2. $\|\bar{X}\|_{\infty} \geq \|\beta_{avg}\|_{\infty}$
3. For any allocation $X \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Theta| \times [K]}$ we have that $\|X\|_{\infty} \leq \|B\|_{\infty}$.

Proof. (1): For the first property we again use the tâtonnement algorithm developed in [38]. Initially in the algorithm the prices are set as $p_k^0 = \frac{B_k}{\sum_{\theta} N_{\theta}}$. However, if there is a resource which no type is interested in at the price p_k^0 then the prices is reduced to

$$p_k^1 = \max_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{w_{\theta,k}}{\max_{k'} \frac{w_{\theta,k'}}{p_{k'}^0}}.$$

Thus we have that

$$\begin{aligned} p_k &\geq \min(p_k^0, p_k^1) \\ &= \min\left(\beta_{avg}^k, \max_{\theta} \frac{w_{\theta,k}}{\max_{k'} \frac{w_{\theta,k'}}{\beta_{avg}^{k'}}}\right) \\ &\geq \min\left(\beta_{avg}^k, \frac{\|w\|_{\min}}{\|w\|_{\max}} \|\beta_{avg}\|_{\min}\right) \\ &= \frac{\|w\|_{\min}}{\|w\|_{\max}} \|\beta_{avg}\|_{\min}. \end{aligned}$$

(2): This property follows as $\sum_{\theta} N_{\theta} \bar{X}_{\theta} = B$ and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

(3): This property follows simply as the maximum allocation for any resource k is bounded above by B_k . □