

Nash-Bargaining-Based Models for Matching Markets, with Implementations and Experimental Results

Mojtaba Hosseini*

mojtaba.hosseini@uci.edu

Vijay V. Vazirani[†]

vazirani@ics.uci.edu

Abstract

This paper addresses the paucity of models of matching markets, both one-sided and two-sided, when utility functions of agents are cardinal. The classical Hylland-Zeckhauser scheme [HZ79], which is the most prominent such model in economics, can be viewed as corresponding to the linear Fisher model, which is most elementary model in market equilibria. Although HZ is based on the attractive idea of using a pricing mechanism, from the viewpoint of use in applications, it has a serious drawback, namely lack of computational efficiency, due to which solving instances of size even 4 or 5 is difficult.

We propose a variety of Nash-bargaining-based models, several of which draw from general equilibrium theory, which has defined a rich collection of market models that generalize the linear Fisher model in order to address more specialized and realistic situations. The Nash bargaining solution satisfies Pareto optimality and symmetry and the allocations it yields are remarkably fair. Furthermore, since the solution is captured via a convex program, it is polynomial time computable. In order to be used in “industrial grade” applications, we give implementations for these models that are extremely time efficient, solving large instances, with $n = 2000$, in one hour on a PC, even for a two-sided matching market.

The idea underlying our work has its origins in [Vaz12], which viewed the linear case of the Arrow-Debreu market model as a Nash bargaining game and gave a combinatorial, polynomial time algorithm for finding allocations via this solution concept, rather than the usual approach of using a pricing mechanism.

*The Paul Merage School of Business, University of California, Irvine.

[†]Computer Science Department, University of California, Irvine. Supported in part by NSF grant CCF-1815901.

1 Introduction

Within the area of matching-based market design, the most prominent solution that uses cardinal utilities¹ is the Hylland-Zeckhauser (HZ) scheme [HZ79]. It uses the power of a pricing mechanism to arrive at an equilibrium allocation and its properties include Pareto optimality, envy-freeness and incentive compatibility in the large. Since it is applicable to an arbitrary one-sided matching market, it is an attractive potential candidate for implementing a new market. However from that viewpoint, it suffers from a serious drawback, namely lack of computational efficiency; see Section 1.2 for a detailed discussion.

In the language of market equilibria, HZ corresponds to the most elementary market model, namely the linear Fisher model. As is well known, general equilibrium theory, an area that was active for over half a century, has defined and extensively studied several fundamental market models that generalize this setting in order to address more specialized and realistic situations. Of these, only the linear Arrow-Debreu setting has been widely explored in the context of matching markets; see Section 1.2 for details and other results.

The purpose of this paper is to address this paucity of models of matching markets, both one-sided and two-sided, when utility functions of agents are cardinal. To guarantee good properties as well as efficient computability, we propose Nash-bargaining-based models. The origins of this idea go back to [Vaz12], which studied the linear case of the Arrow-Debreu market model. Instead of seeking allocations via a pricing mechanism, [Vaz12] formulated it as a Nash bargaining game and gave a combinatorial, polynomial time algorithm for obtaining allocations via this solution concept.

It is easy to conjure up natural situations in which the more general models defined in Section 3 are applicable, quite analogous to their use in market equilibria. The justification for studying them will of course come when they find use in real applications.

The Nash bargaining solution satisfies Pareto optimality and symmetry, and since it maximizes the product of utilities of agents, the allocations it produces are remarkably fair. The latter has been noted by several researchers [CKM⁺19, ACGH20, Mou18] and has been further explored under the name of Nash Social Welfare [CG18, CDG⁺17].

The Nash bargaining solution is captured via a convex program. We present very general models of matching markets for which the resulting convex program has linear constraints thereby ensuring zero duality gap and polynomial time solvability. However, as is well known, polynomial time solvability is often just the beginning of the process of obtaining an “industrial grade” implementation. Towards this end, we give very fast implementations as well as experimental results. In particular, our implementation can solve very large instances, with $n = 2000$, in one hour even for a two-sided matching market. We give an overview of our methodology in Section 1.1.

1.1 Our Results

In Section 3.1, we give five basic models for one-sided matching markets; these cover a wide range of utility functions and other options, e.g., if agents need to be simultaneously matched to

¹For a brief overview of prominent solutions using ordinal utilities, see Section 1.1.

goods in, not one, but several disjoint sets. In Section 3.2 we give a model for the most basic two-sided matching market. This model can be easily enhanced analogous to the other four models one-sided matching markets given in Section 3.1.

In Section 4, we give convex programs capturing the Nash-bargaining-based solution for all the models mentioned above. These convex programs can be solved to ϵ precision in time that is polynomial in the size of the input and $\log 1/\epsilon$ via ellipsoid-based methods [GS62, Vis21].

In Section 5, we present two solution schemes for solving these convex programs. Our methods, namely cutting-plane method [Kel60, Vis21] and Frank-Wolfe method [FW56, Jag13], rely on linear approximations of the convex programs. We present enhancement techniques as well as an overview of how structural properties of these problems can be exploited.

To demonstrate the effectiveness of these methods in handling large-scale instances of the problems, we performed extensive computational experiments in Section 6 and tested the algorithms on instances of up to 2000 agents/goods and 10 segments for the piecewise linear utility functions. In particular, the Frank-Wolfe algorithm is well-suited for matching market models with linear utilities, and is capable of producing sparse optimal solutions. Moreover, the cutting-plane algorithm is able to produce optimal or near-optimal solutions for the more challenging problems of one-sided market models with non-linear utility functions.

1.2 Related Results

Recently [VY21] gave the first comprehensive study of the computational complexity of HZ. Their main message was that it is likely to be highly intractable; a formal proof of this fact remains a tantalizing open problem. They gave an example which has only irrational equilibria; as a consequence, this problem is not in PPAD. They showed membership of the equilibrium computation problem in FIXP and approximate equilibrium in PPAD. As stated in [EY10], which defined FIXP, this class lies somewhere between P and PSPACE, and is likely to be closer to the harder end of PSPACE. On the other hand, PPAD lies in the intersection of the function classes NP and co-NP.

[VY21] left open the question of determining if the corresponding hardness results hold. One reason for the difficulty of establishing such results is that obtaining closed-form solutions to even small instances of HZ, of size 4 or 5, is prohibitive, therefore making the search for “gadgets,” to carry out a reduction, challenging.

At this point, the only positive algorithmic results about HZ are the following: if n , the number of agents (and goods), is a constant, then equilibrium can be computed in polynomial time using algebraic cell decomposition [BPR95, DK08]. [VY21] gave a combinatorial, strongly polynomial time algorithm for computing an equilibrium for the case of dichotomous utilities, i.e., 0/1 utilities. Furthermore, they extend this result to the case of bi-valued utilities, i.e., each agent’s utility for individual goods comes from a set of cardinality two, though the sets may be different for different agents.

The extension of one-sided matching markets to the setting in which agents have initial endowments of goods, called the Arrow-Debreu setting, has several natural applications beyond the original Fisher setting, e.g., allocating students to rooms in a dorm for the next academic year, assuming their current room is their initial endowment. The issue of obtaining such an extension

of the HZ scheme, was studied by Hylland and Zeckhauser. However, this culminated in an example which inherently does not admit an equilibrium [HZ79].

As a recourse, [EMZ19a] introduced the notion of an α -slack Walrasian equilibrium. This is a hybrid between the Fisher and Arrow-Debreu settings in which agents have initial endowments of goods and for a fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, the budget of each agent, for given prices of goods, is $\alpha + (1 - \alpha) \cdot m$, where m is the value for her initial endowment. Via a non-trivial proof, using the Kakutani Fixed Point Theorem, they proved that an α -slack equilibrium always exists. A pure Arrow-Debreu model was proposed in [GTV20] by suitably relaxing the notion of an equilibrium to an ϵ -approximate equilibrium. Their proof of existence of equilibrium follows from that of [EMZ19a].

An interesting recent paper [ACGH20] defines the notion of a random partial improvement mechanism for a one-sided matching market. This mechanism truthfully elicits the cardinal preferences of the agents and outputs a distribution over matchings that approximates every agent's utility in the Nash bargaining solution.

In recent years, several researchers have proposed Hylland-Zeckhauser-type mechanisms for a number of applications, e.g., see [Bud11, HMPY18, Le17, McL18]. The basic scheme has also been generalized in several different directions, including two-sided matching markets, adding quantitative constraints, and to the setting in which agents have initial endowments of goods instead of money, see [EMZ19a, EMZ19b].

2 Preliminaries

2.1 The Nash Bargaining Game

An n -person Nash bargaining game consists of a pair (\mathcal{N}, c) , where $\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is a compact, convex set and $c \in \mathcal{N}$. The set \mathcal{N} is called the *feasible set* – its elements are vectors whose components are utilities that the n players can simultaneously accrue. Point c is the *disagreement point* – its components are utilities which the n players accrue if they decide not to participate in the proposed solution.

The set of n agents will be denoted by A and the agents will be numbered $1, 2, \dots, n$. Instance (\mathcal{N}, c) is said to be *feasible* if there is a point in \mathcal{N} at which each agent does strictly better than her disagreement utility, i.e., $\exists v \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\forall i \in A, v_i > c_i$, and *infeasible* otherwise. In game theory it is customary to assume that the given Nash bargaining problem (\mathcal{N}, c) is feasible; we will make this assumption as well.

The solution to a feasible instance is the point $v \in \mathcal{N}$ that satisfies the following four axioms:

1. *Pareto optimality*: No point in \mathcal{N} weakly dominates v .
2. *Symmetry*: If the players are renumbered, then a corresponding renumber the coordinates of v is a solution to the new instance.
3. *Invariance under affine transformations of utilities*: If the utilities of any player are redefined by multiplying by a scalar and adding a constant, then the solution to the transformed problem is obtained by applying these operations to the particular coordinate of v .

4. *Independence of irrelevant alternatives*: If v is the solution to (\mathcal{N}, c) , and $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is a compact, convex set satisfying $c \in \mathcal{S}$ and $v \in \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, then v is also the solution to (\mathcal{S}, c) .

Via an elegant proof, Nash proved:

Theorem 1 (Nash [Nas53]). *If the game (\mathcal{N}, c) is feasible then there is a unique point in \mathcal{N} satisfying the axioms stated above. Moreover, this point is obtained by maximizing $\prod_{i \in A} (v_i - c_i)$ over $v \in \mathcal{N}$.*

Nash's solution to his bargaining game involves maximizing a concave function over a convex domain, and is therefore the optimal solution to the following convex program.

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{i \in A} \log(v_i - c_i) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & v \in \mathcal{N} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

As a consequence, if for a specific game, a separation oracle can be implemented in polynomial time, then using the ellipsoid algorithm one can get as good an approximation to the solution of this convex program as desired in time polynomial in the number of bits of accuracy needed [GLS12].

2.2 Fisher Market Model

The *Fisher market model* consists of a set $A = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ of agents and a set $G = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ of infinitely divisible goods. By fixing the units for each good, we may assume without loss of generality that there is a unit of each good in the market. Each agent i has money $m_i \in \mathbb{Q}_+$.

Let x_{ij} , $1 \leq j \leq m$ represent a *bundle of goods allocated to agent i* . Each agent i has a utility function $u : \mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ giving the utility accrued by i from a bundle of goods. We will assume that u is concave and weakly monotonic. Each good j is assigned a non-negative price, p_j . Allocations and prices, x and p , are said to form an *equilibrium* if each agent obtains a utility maximizing bundle of goods at prices p and the *market clears*, i.e., each good is fully sold to the extent of one unit and all money of agents is fully spent. We will assume that each agent derives positive utility from some good and for each agent, there is a good which gives her positive utility; clearly, otherwise we may remove that agent or good from consideration.

2.3 Arrow-Debreu Market Model

The Arrow-Debreu market model, also known as the *exchange model* differs from Fisher's model in that agents come to the market with initial endowments of good instead of money. The union of all goods in initial endowments are all the goods in the market. Once again, by redefining the units of each good, we may assume that there is a total of one unit of each good in the market. The utility functions of agents are as before. The problem now is to find non-negative prices for all goods so that if each agent sells her initial endowment and buys an optimal bundle of goods, the market clears. Clearly, if p is equilibrium prices then so is any scaling of p by a positive factor.

2.4 Hylland-Zeckhauser Scheme

Let $A = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ be a set of n agents and $G = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ be a set of n indivisible goods. The goal of the HZ scheme is to allocate exactly one good to each agent. However, in order to use the power of a pricing mechanism, which endows the HZ scheme with the properties of Pareto optimality and incentive compatibility in the large, it casts this one-sided matching market in the mold of a linear Fisher market as follows.

Goods are rendered divisible by assuming that there is one unit of probability share of each good, and utilities u_{ij} s are defined as in a linear Fisher market. Let x_{ij} be the allocation of probability share that agent i receives of good j . Then, $\sum_j u_{ij}x_{ij}$ is the *expected utility* accrued by agent i . Each agent has 1 dollar for buying these probability shares and each good j has a price $p_j \geq 0$.

Beyond a Fisher market, an additional constraint is that the total probability share allocated to each agent is one unit, i.e., the entire allocation must form a *fractional perfect matching* in the complete bipartite graph over vertex sets A and G . Subject to these constraints, each agent buys a utility maximizing bundle of goods. Another point of departure from a linear Fisher market is that in general, an agent's optimal bundle may cost less than one dollar, i.e., the agents are not required to spend all their money. Since each good is fully sold, the market clears. Hence these are defined to be *equilibrium allocation and prices*.

Clearly, an equilibrium allocation can be viewed as a doubly stochastic matrix. The Birkhoff-von Neumann procedure then extracts a random underlying perfect matching in such a way that the expected utility accrued to each agent from the integral perfect matching is the same as from the fractional perfect matching. Since *ex ante* Pareto optimality implies *ex post* Pareto optimality, the integral allocation will also be Pareto optimal.

3 Nash-Bargaining-Based Models

3.1 One-Sided Matching Markets

We will define five one-sided matching market models based on our Nash bargaining approach. It is easy to see that the fourth one generalizes the first three; however, the earlier ones involve less notation and have an independent standing of their own, hence necessitating all four definitions. For the case of linear utilities, we have singled out the Fisher and Arrow-Debreu versions, namely *ILF* and *ILAD*, since we will study both in some detail later in the paper. For more general utility functions we have defined only the Arrow-Debreu version; the Fisher version is obtained by setting all disagreement utilities to zero.

The fifth market has a different character. It involves two distinct types of goods; each agent wishes to get one unit of each type. We have assumed linear utilities for this market; generalizing to other utility functions is straightforward using the definitions of the previous four markets.

Our one-sided matching market models consist of a set $A = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ of agents and a set $G = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ of infinitely divisible goods; observe that there is an equal number of agents and goods. There is one unit of each good and each agent needs to be allocated a total of one unit of goods. Hence the allocation needs to be a fractional perfect matching, as defined next.

Definition 2. Let us name the coordinates of a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m^2}$ by pairs i, j for $i \in A$ and $j \in G$. Then x is said to be a *fractional perfect matching* if

$$\forall i \in A : \sum_j x_{ij} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \forall j \in G : \sum_i x_{ij} = 1.$$

As mentioned in Section 2, an equilibrium allocation can be viewed as a doubly stochastic matrix, and the Birkhoff-von Neumann procedure [Bir46, VN53] can be used to extract a random underlying perfect matching in such a way that the expected utility accrued to each agent from the integral perfect matching is the same as from the fractional perfect matching.

1). Under the *linear Fisher Nash bargaining one-sided matching market*, abbreviated *1LF*, each agent $i \in A$ has a linear utility function, as defined in Section 2.2. Corresponding to each fractional perfect matching x , there is a vector v_x in the feasible set \mathcal{N} ; its components are the utilities derived by the agents under the allocation given by x . The disagreement point is the origin. Observe that the setup of *1LF* is identical to that of the HZ mechanism; the difference lies in the definition of the solution to an instance.

2). Under the *linear Arrow-Debreu Nash bargaining one-sided matching market*, abbreviated *1LAD*, each agent $i \in A$ has a linear utility function, as above. Additionally, we are specified an initial fractional perfect matching x_I which gives the initial endowments of the agents. Each agent has one unit of initial endowment over all the goods and the total endowment of each good over all the agents is one unit, as given by x_I . These two pieces of information define the utility accrued by each agent from her initial endowment; this is her disagreement point c_i . As stated in Section 2.1, we will assume that the problem is feasible, i.e., there is a fractional perfect matching, defining a redistribution of the goods, under which each agent i derives strictly more utility than c_i . Each vector $v \in \mathcal{N}$ is as defined in *1LF*. Henceforth, we will consider the slightly more general problem in which are specified the disagreement point c and not the initial endowments x_I . There is no guarantee that c comes from a valid fractional perfect matching of initial endowments. However, we still want the problem to be feasible.

3). The *separable, piecewise-linear concave Arrow-Debreu Nash bargaining one-sided matching market*, abbreviated *1SAD*, is analogous to *1LAD*, with the difference that each agent has a separable, piecewise-linear concave utility function, hence generalizing the linear utility functions specified in *1LAD*. We next define these functions in detail.

For each agent i and good j , function $f_i^j : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ gives the utility derived by i as a function of the amount of good j she receives. Each f_i^j is a non-negative, non-decreasing, piecewise-linear, concave function. The overall utility of buyer i , $u_i(x)$, for bundle $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of goods, is additively separable over the goods, i.e., $u_i(x) = \sum_{j \in G} f_i^j(x_j)$.

We will call each piece of f_i^j a *segment*. Number the segments of f_i^j in order of decreasing slope; throughout we will assume that these segments are indexed by k and that S_{ij} is the set of all such indices. Let σ_{ijk} , $k \in S_{ij}$, denote the k^{th} segment, l_{ijk} denote the amount of good j represented by this segment; we will assume that the last segment in each function is of unbounded length. Let u_{ijk} denote the rate at which i accrues utility per unit of good j received, when she is getting an allocation corresponding to this segment. Clearly, the maximum utility she can receive corresponding to this segment is $u_{ijk} \cdot l_{ijk}$. We will assume that u_{ijk} and l_{ijk} are rational numbers.

Finally, let S_σ^i be the set of all indices (j, k) corresponding to the segments in all utility functions of agent i under the given instance, i.e.,

$$S_\sigma^i = \{(j, k) \mid j \in G, k \in S_{ij}\}.$$

4). The *non-separable piecewise-linear concave Arrow-Debreu Nash bargaining one-sided matching market*, abbreviated *1NAD*, differs from *1SAD* in that agents' utility functions are now assumed to be non-separable, piecewise-linear concave. These functions are defined next.

For each agent i , the parameter $l(i)$ specifies the number of hyperplanes used for defining the utility of i . The latter, $u_i(x)$, for bundle $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of goods is defined to be

$$u_i(x) = \min_{k \leq l(i)} \left\{ \sum_{j \in G} a_{ij}^k x_{ij} + b_i^k \right\},$$

where a_{ij}^k and b_i^k are non-negative rational numbers. Furthermore, $b_i^k = 0$ for at least one value of k so that the utility derived by i from the empty bundle is zero.

Leontief utilities is a fundamental special case of non-separable piecewise-linear concave utilities under which agents want goods in specified ratios. In this case, for each agent i , we are specified a set $S_i \subseteq G$ of goods she is interested in, and

$$u_i(x) = \min_{j \in S_i} \left\{ \frac{x_{ij}}{a_{ij}} \right\},$$

where $a_{ij} > 0$ are rational numbers.

5). We turn next to more general settings in which each agent needs to be matched to goods in multiple sets. For instance, suppose we are given two sets of goods, G_1 and G_2 , with $|G_1| = |G_2| = n$, and each agent needs to be matched to one good in each set. If the utility functions of agents are additively separable across G_1 and G_2 , the answer is straightforward, namely independently solve the two matching market problems, (A, G_1) and (A, G_2) .

Next we consider the case of non-separable utility functions. Under the *linear Fisher Nash bargaining one-sided matching market over two types of goods*, abbreviated *1LF2G*, the utility of agent $i \in A$ is defined to be

$$v_i = \sum_{j \in G_1, l \in G_2} u_{ijl} x_{ijl},$$

where u_{ijl} is the utility accrued by i on obtaining one unit of $j \in G_1$ and one unit of $l \in G_2$. There are numerous natural applications of this problem, e.g., allocation of courses to students from two different majors. One can define generalizations of *1LF2G*, along the lines of the generalizations of *1LF* defined above, in a straightforward manner.

In Section 4 we prove that each of the matching markets defined above admits a convex program.

Remark 3. Throughout this paper, we will index elements of A, G and S_{ij} by i, j and k , respectively. When the domain of i, j or k is not specified, especially in summations, it should be assumed to be A, G and S_{ij} , respectively. Furthermore, for the market *1LF2G*, we will index the elements of G_1 and G_2 by j and l , respectively.

3.2 Two-Sided Matching Markets

Our two-sided matching market model consist of a set $A = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ of agents and a set $J = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ of jobs. For uniformity, we have assumed that there is an equal number of agents and jobs, though the model can be easily enhanced and made more general. Our goal is to find an integral perfect matching between agents and jobs; however, we will relax this to finding a fractional perfect matching, x , followed by rounding as described above. We will explicitly define only the simplest case of two-sided markets; more general models follow along the same lines as one-sided markets.

Under the *linear Fisher Nash bargaining two-sided matching market*, abbreviated *2LF*, the utility accrued by agent $i \in A$ under allocation x ,

$$u_i(x) = \sum_{j \in J} u_{ij} x_{ij},$$

where u_{ij} is the utility accrued by i if she were assigned job j integrally. Analogously, the utility accrued by job $j \in J$ under allocation x ,

$$w_j(x) = \sum_{i \in A} w_{ij} x_{ij},$$

where w_{ij} is the utility accrued by j if it were assigned to i integrally.

In keeping with the axiom of symmetry under Nash bargaining, we will posit that the desires of agents and jobs are equally important and we are led to defining the feasible set in a $2n$ dimensional space, i.e., $\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^{2n}$. The first n components of feasible point $v \in \mathcal{N}$ represent the utilities derived by the n agents, i.e., $u_i(x)$ s, and the last n components the utilities derived by the n jobs, i.e., $w_j(x)$, under a fractional perfect matching x . Under *2LF*, the disagreement point is the origin, and we seek the Nash bargaining point. A convex program of *2LF* is given in (7).

4 Convex Programs for the Models

We start by presenting convex programs for *1LF* and *1LAD*, namely (2) and (3). These differ only in that the latter has the parameters c_i in the objective function.

$$\max \quad \sum_{i \in A} \log(v_i) \quad (2a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad v_i = \sum_j u_{ij} x_{ij} \quad \forall i \in A, \quad (2b)$$

$$\sum_j x_{ij} = 1 \quad \forall i \in A, \quad (2c)$$

$$\sum_i x_{ij} = 1 \quad \forall j \in G, \quad (2d)$$

$$x_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in A, \forall j \in G \quad (2e)$$

$$\max \sum_{i \in A} \log(v_i - c_i) \quad (3a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad v_i = \sum_j u_{ij} x_{ij} \quad \forall i \in A, \quad (3b)$$

$$\sum_j x_{ij} = 1 \quad \forall i \in A, \quad (3c)$$

$$\sum_i x_{ij} = 1 \quad \forall j \in G, \quad (3d)$$

$$x_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in A, \forall j \in G \quad (3e)$$

Program (4) is a convex program for *1SAD*.

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{i \in A} \log(v_i - c_i) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & v_i = \sum_j \sum_k u_{ijk} x_{ijk} \quad \forall i \in A, \\ & \sum_j \sum_k x_{ijk} = 1 \quad \forall i \in A, \\ & \sum_i \sum_k x_{ijk} = 1 \quad \forall j \in G, \\ & x_{ijk} \leq l_{ijk} \quad \forall i \in A, \forall j \in G, \forall k \in S_{ij}, \\ & x_{ijk} \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in A, \forall j \in G, \forall k \in S_{ij} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Program (5) is a convex program for *1LF2G*.

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{i \in A} \log(v_i) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & v_i = \sum_{j,l} u_{ijl} x_{ijl} \quad \forall i \in A, \\ & \sum_{j,l} x_{ijl} = 1 \quad \forall i \in A, \\ & \sum_{i,l} x_{ijl} = 1 \quad \forall j \in G_1, \\ & \sum_{i,j} x_{ijl} = 1 \quad \forall l \in G_2, \\ & x_{ijl} \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in A, \forall j \in G_1, \forall l \in G_2 \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Program (6) is a convex programs for *1NAD*.

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & \sum_{i \in A} \log(v_i - c_i) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & v_i \leq \sum_j a_{ij}^k x_{ij} + b_i^k \quad \forall i \in A, \forall k \leq l(i), \\
& \sum_j x_{ij} = 1 \quad \forall i \in A, \\
& \sum_i x_{ij} = 1 \quad \forall j \in G, \\
& v_i \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in A, \\
& x_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in A, \forall j \in G
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Program (7) is a convex program for $2LF$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & \sum_{i \in A} \log(v_i) + \sum_{j \in J} \log(v_j) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & v_i = \sum_j u_{ij} x_{ij} \quad \forall i \in A, \\
& v_j = \sum_i w_{ij} x_{ij} \quad \forall j \in J, \\
& \sum_j x_{ij} = 1 \quad \forall i \in A, \\
& \sum_i x_{ij} = 1 \quad \forall j \in J, \\
& x_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in A, \forall j \in J
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

5 Solution Methods

Our solution methods for solving the proposed convex programs are based on linear approximations of these problems. We propose two general frameworks relying on the first order approximation of the objective functions: (a) Cutting-plane algorithm, and (b) Frank-Wolfe algorithm. For simplicity of exposition, we focus on the simpler models $1LAD$ (and $1LF$) and $2LF$ to describe the algorithms. We will explain how these algorithms can be extended to other models.

5.1 Cutting-plane Algorithm

The underlying principle in the cutting-plane method for convex programs with nonlinear objective function is to outer-approximate the epigraph of the objective function through a series of linear programs [Kel60, Vis21]. In $1LAD$, let $f(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i \in A} \log(v_i - c_i)$. Since f is concave in \mathbf{v} , for a given solution $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ we have:

$$f(\mathbf{v}) \leq f(\hat{\mathbf{v}}) + \sum_{i \in A} \frac{\partial f(\hat{\mathbf{v}})}{\partial v_i} (v_i - \hat{v}_i) = f(\hat{\mathbf{v}}) - n + \sum_{i \in A} \frac{v_i - c_i}{\hat{v}_i - c_i} \tag{8}$$

Therefore, we can rewrite $1LAD$ as the following semi-infinite linear program:

Algorithm 1: Cutting-plane algorithm for solving *1LAD*

- 1 Find an initial solution $(\mathbf{v}^{(0)}, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})$;
 - 2 Initialize $\hat{\mathcal{N}} \leftarrow \{\mathbf{v}^{(0)}\}$; $LB \leftarrow f(\mathbf{v}^{(0)})$; $UB \leftarrow +\infty$; $t \leftarrow 1$;
 - 3 $(\mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{x}^*) \leftarrow (\mathbf{v}^{(0)}, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})$;
 - 4 **while** *not converged* **do**
 - 5 Solve LP (9) with $\hat{\mathcal{N}}$ in place of \mathcal{N} and obtain master solution $(\mathbf{v}^{(t)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \eta^{(t)})$;
 - 6 $UB \leftarrow \eta^{(t)}$; $\hat{\mathcal{N}} \leftarrow \hat{\mathcal{N}} \cup \{\mathbf{v}^{(t)}\}$;
 - 7 **if** $LB < f(\mathbf{v}^{(t)})$ **then**
 - 8 $LB \leftarrow f(\mathbf{v}^{(t)})$; $(\mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{x}^*) \leftarrow (\mathbf{v}^{(t)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t)})$;
 - 9 $t \leftarrow t + 1$;
-

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max \quad \eta \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad \eta \leq f(\hat{\mathbf{v}}) - n + \sum_{i \in A} \frac{v_i - c_i}{\hat{v}_i - c_i} \quad \forall \hat{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathcal{N}, \\
& \quad \quad v_i = \sum_j u_{ij} x_{ij} \quad \forall i \in A, \\
& \quad \quad \sum_j x_{ij} = 1 \quad \forall i \in A, \\
& \quad \quad \sum_i x_{ij} = 1 \quad \forall j \in G, \\
& \quad \quad x_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in A, \forall j \in G,
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where \mathcal{N} is the set of vectors $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ such that $\hat{v}_i > c_i$. Based on this formulation, we solve *1LAD* using the cutting-plane algorithm given in Algorithm 1. Note that solving LP (9) with a subset of \mathcal{N} yields an upperbound (UB) on the optimal value of *1LAD*. On the other hand, any feasible solution provides a lowerbound (LB) on the optimal value. Therefore, we may assess convergence of Algorithm 1 using the following optimality gap

$$\text{Gap} = \frac{UB - LB}{LB}. \tag{10}$$

5.1.1 Enhancement techniques

Cutting-plane algorithms are notorious for “zig-zagging” from one point in the feasible region to another. To stabilize the algorithm, in the spirit of the work of [BAN07], instead of cutting off the current solution $(\mathbf{v}^{(t)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t)})$, we cut off an intermediate point $(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = \alpha(\mathbf{v}^{(t)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t)}) + (1 - \alpha)(\mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$, where $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ is a given parameter and $(\mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$ is the current incumbent solution. To guarantee convergence, at each iteration of Algorithm 1, starting with an initial α , one can increase α until the cut produced using $(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}})$ cuts off current solution $(\mathbf{v}^{(t)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \eta^{(t)})$ (i.e., until $\eta^{(t)} > f(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}) - n + \sum_{i \in A} \frac{v_i^{(t)} - c_i}{\tilde{v}_i - c_i}$) or until $\alpha = 1$. In our experiments, we initialize α by solving $\max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} f(\alpha \mathbf{v}^{(t)} + (1 - \alpha) \mathbf{v}^*)$ via line search.

At each iteration of Algorithm 1, we add a single constraint of the form (8) to the current LP approximation of $1LAD$. Using the Dual Simplex algorithm, we can reuse the information obtained in the previous iteration (e.g. the basis), and thus avoid solving the LPs from scratch at each iteration.

5.1.2 Extension to other models

Algorithm 1 extends to $2LF$, $1SAD$, $1NAD$, and $1LF2G$ easily by replacing the objective function and the constraints with the suitable function and constraints, respectively. For instance, for $2LF$, the cutting planes take the form of

$$\eta \leq \sum_{i \in A} \log(\hat{v}_i) + \sum_{j \in G} \log(\hat{v}_j) - 2n + \sum_{i \in A} \frac{v_i}{\hat{v}_i} + \sum_{j \in G} \frac{v_j}{\hat{v}_j}.$$

In $1SAD$, $1NAD$, and $1LF2G$ the constraints are updated accordingly.

5.2 Frank-Wolfe Algorithm

Frank-Wolfe (FW) method [FW56, Jag13] is one of the simplest and earliest known iterative algorithms for solving non-linear convex optimization problems of the form

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f(\mathbf{x}),$$

where f is a concave function and \mathcal{X} is a compact convex set. The underlying principle in Frank-Wolfe method is to replace the non-linear objective function f with its linear approximation $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) + \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{(0)})^\top (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(0)})$ at a trial point $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} \in \mathcal{X}$, and solve a simpler problem

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}),$$

to produce an ‘‘atom’’ solution $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$. The algorithm then iterates by performing line search between $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ to produce the next trial point $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}$ as a convex combination of $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$.

Algorithm 2 presents the FW algorithm for solving instances of $1LAD$, in which the objective function f is defined as $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i \in A} \log(\sum_{j \in G} u_{ij} x_{ij} - c_i)$ and the feasible region is defined as

$$\mathcal{X} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n^2} : \sum_{j \in G} x_{ij} = 1 \quad \forall i \in A, \sum_{i \in A} x_{ij} = 1 \quad \forall j \in G\}.$$

Frank-Wolfe method is particularly useful when \mathcal{X} is a polyhedron and one can exploit its combinatorial properties. In the case of $1LAD$ (also $1LF$ and $2LF$), the feasible region \mathcal{X} corresponds to a matching polyhedron. Hence, at each iteration of Algorithm 2, one can produce an *atom* by solving a matching problem. Consequently, the optimal solution produced by this algorithm is a convex combination of some perfect matchings. This property of the FW method is particularly interesting when the step-size at each iteration is a rational number and the algorithm terminates in few iterations, yielding a sparse rational convex combination of perfect matchings.

As discussed in [Jag13], it follows from concavity of f that at iteration t of Algorithm 2,

$$\sum_{i,j} g_{ij}(\hat{x}_{ij}^{(t)} - x_{ij}^{(t)}) \geq f(\mathbf{x}^*) - f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}),$$

where \mathbf{x}^* is the optimal solution. Therefore, we may produce a certificate for the current approximation quality using the following optimality gap

$$\text{Gap} = \frac{\sum_{i,j} g_{ij}(\hat{x}_{ij}^{(t)} - x_{ij}^{(t)})}{f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})}. \quad (11)$$

Algorithm 2: Frank-Wolfe algorithm for solving *1LAD*

- 1 $t \leftarrow 0$;
 - 2 Find an initial perfect matching $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}$;
 - 3 **while** *not converged* **do**
 - 4 Compute $g_{ij} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{ij}} f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) = \frac{u_{ij}}{v_i^{(t)} - c_i}$, where $v_i^{(t)} = \sum_{j \in G} u_{ij} x_{ij}^{(t)}$;
 - 5 Compute perfect matching $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}$ by solving the following problem:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \in G} g_{ij} x_{ij}$$
 - 6 Compute the step-size $\gamma^{(t)}$ using the following line search

$$\gamma^{(t)} = \arg \max_{\gamma \in [0,1]} f\left((1 - \gamma)\mathbf{x}^{(t)} + \gamma\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}\right)$$
 - 7 Update $\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)} = (1 - \gamma^{(t)})\mathbf{x}^{(t)} + \gamma^{(t)}\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}$;
 - 8 $t \leftarrow t + 1$;
-

5.2.1 Computing the step-size

The line search step in Algorithm 2 can be simplified to solving a problem of the form

$$\gamma^{(t)} = \arg \max_{\gamma \in [0,1]} \sum_{i \in A} \log((1 - \gamma)v_i^{(t)} + \gamma\hat{v}_i^{(t)} - c_i),$$

where $\hat{v}_i^{(t)} = \sum_{j \in G} u_{ij} \hat{x}_{ij}^{(t)}$, which can be solved efficiently using a general line search algorithm such as bisection.

5.2.2 Extension to other models

As in the cutting-plane method, Algorithm 2 may be extended to other models. For *2LF*, it suffices to compute the gradient g_{ij} as

$$g_{ij} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{ij}} f(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) = \frac{u_{ij}}{v_i^{(t)}} + \frac{w_{ij}}{v_j^{(t)}}.$$

For other models, however, although the general framework can be extended, since the feasible region no longer defines a matching polyhedron, finding a new atom $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}$ is not straightforward. Our primary computational experiments show that a naïve implementation of Frank-Wolfe algorithm does not scale for large instances of these problems.

5.3 Initial Perfect Matching

In *1LF*, since $v_i = \sum_{j \in G} x_{ij} u_{ij}$ and $\sum_{j \in G} x_{ij} = 1$ for each $i \in A$, v_i is a convex combination of $u_{i1}, u_{i2}, \dots, u_{in}$ with weights $x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{in}$. Concavity of $\log(\cdot)$ implies that

$$\log(v_i) = \log\left(\sum_{j \in G} x_{ij} u_{ij}\right) \geq \sum_{j \in G} x_{ij} \log(u_{ij}).$$

Therefore, $\sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \in G} x_{ij} \log(u_{ij})$ provides a lowerbound on $\sum_{i \in A} \log(v_i)$, thus maximizing the surrogate linear function $\sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \in G} x_{ij} \log(u_{ij})$ effectively produces a near optimal solution to *1LF*. In fact, if the optimal solution to *1LF* is a perfect matching, then the lowerbound is tight.

To avoid unboundedness, we define $\log_M(\alpha) = \log(\alpha)$ for $\alpha > 0$ and $\log_M(\alpha) = -M$ for $\alpha = 0$, in which M is a large number. With this definition, we solve the following matching problem to produce a near optimal solution:

$$\max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \in G} x_{ij} \log_M(u_{ij}).$$

Similarly, for *2LF*, we use the surrogate linear function $\sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \in G} x_{ij} (\log_M(u_{ij}) + \log_M(w_{ij}))$, since v_j is also a convex combination of $w_{1j}, w_{2j}, \dots, w_{nj}$ with weights $x_{1j}, x_{2j}, \dots, x_{nj}$. Initial solutions for *1SAD*, *1NAD*, and *1LF2G* may be produced by devising approximate utility matrices.

6 Computational Results

We coded our algorithms in C# and solved the linear programs using the ILOG Concert library and CPLEX 12.10 solver. All experiments were conducted on a Dell desktop equipped with Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2680 v3 at 2.50GHz with 8 Cores and 32 GB of memory running a 64-bit Windows 10 operating system. We used the Dual Simplex method for solving the LPs in Algorithm 1 by setting the `RootAlgorithm` parameter to `Cplex.Algorithm.Dual`. Although the matching problems in Algorithm 2 can be solved by specialized algorithms, after primary experiments, we found that using a general-purpose LP solver such as the Primal Simplex method benefits from better warm-start mechanism making the overall implementation simpler. We used the primal simplex method by setting the CPLEX parameter `RootAlgorithm` to `Cplex.Algorithm.Primal`. In our experiments, we terminated Algorithms 1 and 2 upon reaching either an optimality gap of 10^{-7} , running time of 3600 seconds, or after 1000 iterations.

6.1 Computational Results for *1LAD*, *1LF* and *2LF*

We performed computational experiments on *1LAD*, *1LF* and *2LF* by producing random utility matrices u (and w in *2LF*) as follows. We considered two general scenarios: (a) **binary**, in which the entries of matrices u and w were drawn from $\{0, 1\}$, and (b) **nonbinary**, in which entries of matrices u and w were general integer values. In both scenarios, u_{ij} was set to 0 with probability $1 - \rho$, where ρ represents the density of the utility matrix. For the nonbinary case, positive values of u_{ij} were drawn uniformly from the set $\{1, 2, \dots, 20\}$. In *1LAD*, the parameters c_i were uniformly chosen from the set $\{\frac{\bar{u}}{3}, \frac{\bar{u}}{4}, 0\}$, where $\bar{u} = \frac{1}{4} \max_{ij} \{u_{ij}\}$ to ensure feasibility.

n	ρ	binary		nonbinary			
		Time (CP)	Time (FW)	Time (CP)	Iter. (CP)	Time (FW)	Iter. (FW)
10	0.33	0.004	0.000	0.005	10.0	0.000	3.7
	0.67	0.000	0.000	0.003	3.6	0.000	1.6
20	0.33	0.003	0.000	0.003	15.6	0.006	7.8
	0.67	0.003	0.000	0.003	4.4	0.006	2.2
50	0.33	0.012	0.003	0.028	14.6	0.038	3.4
	0.67	0.012	0.006	0.025	5.8	0.041	3.0
100	0.05	0.360	0.071	0.642	113.0	0.125	14.0
	0.33	0.059	0.016	0.094	13.8	0.197	4.4
	0.67	0.066	0.019	0.116	6.6	0.247	9.0
200	0.05	0.794	0.094	1.201	70.0	1.000	11.2
	0.33	1.106	0.116	0.947	16.4	1.059	6.0
	0.67	0.818	0.141	0.504	1.0	0.134	1.0
500	0.05	13.188	1.391	7.783	38.0	9.800	9.4
	0.33	26.162	2.044	6.012	1.2	1.281	1.4
	0.67	14.831	2.647	5.034	1.0	1.100	1.0
1000	0.05	115.617	10.578	62.772	40.0	83.514	9.0
	0.33	220.912	21.150	40.151	1.0	5.612	1.0
	0.67	171.834	29.788	33.307	1.0	6.363	1.0
2000	0.05	2153.735	71.758	463.243	9.5	98.265	12.5
	0.33	>3600.000	251.906	317.391	1.0	30.153	1.0
	0.67	3410.458	353.700	207.954	1.0	37.028	1.0

Table 1: Computational results for *1LAD*

Tables 1, 2 and 3 present the computational results for models *1LAD*, *1LF* and *2LF*, respectively. In these tables, values under columns “Time”, “Gap” and “Iter.” represent the running time (in seconds), optimality gap (as per equations (10) and (11)) and the number of iterations, respectively. Each entry represents average value over 5 randomly generated instances for each pair of n (number of agents/goods) and ρ (density of the utility matrices). In these tables, whenever a column is missing, it means the corresponding values were 0 across all experiments.

We observe that both CP and FW are able to solve all the *1LAD* and *1LF* instances and the majority of the *2LF* instances to optimality within the given time/iteration limits. FW outperforms CP in larger instances in terms of computation time, particularly in *1LF* and *1LAD*, and the lower computation time of FW suggests its capacity for handling even larger instances.

As explained in Section 5.2, FW also has the advantage of producing optimal solutions that are convex combinations of some perfect matchings. This property of FW results in producing rational solutions for *1LF* with binary utilities. Figure 1 illustrates an example of such solution. While the solutions produced by CP and FW are both numerically optimal in terms of objective value (respectively, -1.093929467 and -1.093929341), only the solution produced by FW is the true rational optimal solution.

6.2 Computational Results for *1SAD* and *1NAD*

We generated random instance for *1SAD* by constructing piece-wise linear concave utility functions each with K segments of equal size $\frac{1}{K}$. To ensure that the slopes of the segments for each

n	ρ	binary				nonbinary			
		CP		FW		CP		FW	
		Time	Iter.	Time	Iter.	Time	Iter.	Time	Iter.
10	0.33	0.012	28.0	0.003	3.6	0.004	18.4	0.020	144.4
	0.67	0.003	1.0	0.003	1.0	0.000	2.8	0.000	3.6
20	0.33	0.000	1.0	0.000	1.0	0.006	12.6	0.009	69.0
	0.67	0.003	1.0	0.000	1.0	0.006	3.6	0.003	4.8
50	0.33	0.009	1.0	0.006	1.0	0.025	13.2	0.068	37.8
	0.67	0.003	1.0	0.000	1.0	0.028	7.2	0.050	13.0
100	0.05	3.786	322.4	0.034	20.2	0.579	120.0	1.467	363.0
	0.33	0.047	1.0	0.016	1.0	0.103	15.2	0.259	18.2
	0.67	0.040	1.0	0.016	1.0	0.157	16.0	0.325	16.6
200	0.05	0.832	1.0	0.088	1.0	1.352	67.2	2.181	84.2
	0.33	1.362	1.0	0.110	1.0	1.753	26.2	1.671	17.0
	0.67	1.278	1.0	0.144	1.0	0.422	1.0	0.141	1.0
500	0.05	11.237	1.0	1.375	1.0	10.561	36.0	12.510	24.0
	0.33	17.156	1.0	2.034	1.0	7.250	2.2	1.356	2.2
	0.67	15.209	1.0	2.650	1.0	4.179	1.0	1.097	1.0
1000	0.05	115.836	1.0	10.563	1.0	179.148	63.0	90.165	18.0
	0.33	220.490	1.0	21.194	1.0	91.802	1.0	5.594	1.0
	0.67	171.229	1.0	29.763	1.0	39.073	1.0	6.303	1.0
2000	0.05	2243.672	1.0	71.570	1.0	740.874	11.0	110.094	15.0
	0.33	>3600.000	1.0	251.225	1.0	1030.052	1.0	30.119	1.0
	0.67	3417.438	1.0	350.506	1.0	360.640	1.0	36.944	1.0

Table 2: Computational results for $1LF$

n	ρ	binary						nonbinary					
		CP			FW			CP			FW		
		Time	Gap	Iter.	Time	Gap	Iter.	Time	Gap	Iter.	Time	Gap	Iter.
10	0.33	0.039	0.00%	82.4	0.149	0.04%	744.0	0.010	0.00%	56.3	0.000	0.00%	1.0
	0.67	0.000	0.00%	1.0	0.009	0.00%	1.0	0.003	0.00%	23.0	0.062	0.00%	354.4
20	0.33	0.038	0.00%	73.2	0.150	0.05%	717.4	0.056	0.00%	91.6	0.000	0.00%	1.0
	0.67	0.000	0.00%	1.0	0.000	0.00%	1.0	0.012	0.00%	36.2	0.038	0.00%	168.8
50	0.33	0.034	0.00%	16.8	0.009	0.00%	3.0	0.519	0.00%	184.8	1.962	0.01%	641.2
	0.67	0.012	0.00%	1.0	0.003	0.00%	1.0	0.075	0.00%	49.0	0.244	0.00%	115.0
100	0.33	0.046	0.00%	1.0	0.022	0.00%	1.0	1.584	0.00%	199.8	3.736	0.01%	351.6
	0.67	0.053	0.00%	1.0	0.019	0.00%	1.0	0.219	0.00%	32.6	0.909	0.00%	38.4
	0.05	2501.869	0.02%	1000.0	57.796	0.07%	1000.0	224.755	0.00%	1000.0	257.177	0.04%	1000.0
200	0.33	0.275	0.00%	1.0	0.109	0.00%	1.0	6.143	0.00%	188.0	8.663	0.00%	148.8
	0.67	0.303	0.00%	1.0	0.128	0.00%	1.0	1.573	0.00%	54.8	9.025	0.00%	38.0
	0.05	3611.900	2.03%	240.0	618.143	0.11%	1000.0	3402.853	0.01%	1000.0	3316.252	0.03%	1000.0
500	0.33	7.650	0.00%	1.0	1.063	0.00%	1.0	45.583	0.00%	183.2	67.841	0.00%	59.8
	0.67	24.494	0.00%	1.0	1.872	0.00%	1.0	14.520	0.00%	69.2	39.119	0.00%	24.8
	0.05	3644.687	1.93%	126.0	3601.991	0.13%	846.0	3614.267	0.17%	398.0	3611.011	0.09%	189.4
1000	0.33	104.917	0.00%	1.0	6.690	0.00%	1.0	332.308	0.00%	184.2	551.121	0.00%	37.0
	0.67	219.703	0.00%	1.0	18.000	0.00%	1.0	127.147	0.00%	74.4	429.229	0.00%	20.4
	0.05	3643.479	43.30%	16.4	3605.005	0.15%	373.4	3692.553	3.19%	30.4	3636.312	0.26%	37.0
2000	0.33	1195.500	0.00%	1.0	49.934	0.00%	1.0	2065.352	0.00%	161.7	3296.535	0.00%	27.0
	0.67	861.005	0.00%	1.0	209.566	0.00%	1.0	2451.082	0.00%	112.3	3318.404	0.00%	18.6

Table 3: Computational results for $2LF$

1 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0	0.16 0 0.3 0.3 0.16 0 0 0 0 0	0.16666333 0.16658701 0.33291273 0.16694404 0.1668929 0 0 0 0 0
1 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0
1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0.83 0 0 0.16 0 0 0 0 0	0 0.83332482 0 0 0.1666716 0 0 0 0 0
1 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0	0 0 0.6 0 0.16 0 0 0.16 0 0	0 0 0.66708727 0 0.16645611 0 0 0.16645662 0 0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0	0 0 0 0 0.16 0 0 0.83 0 0	0 0 0 0 0.16645662 0 0 0.83354338 0 0
1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0.83 0 0 0 0.16 0 0 0 0 0	0.83333309 0 0 0 0.16666691 0 0 0 0 0
0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1
0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0.16 0 0.16 0.16 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0.83305596 0.16685587 0 0 0 0 0

(a) Utility matrix (b) Solution produced by FW (c) Solution produced by CP

Figure 1: An example where FW produces a rational optimal solution for an instance of $1LF$.

pair (i, j) (i.e., u_{ijk}) are non-decreasing (i.e., $u_{ij1} > u_{ij2} > \dots > u_{ijK}$), we first generated K random values σ_{ijk} uniformly drawn from the set $\{1, \dots, 20\}$, and then set $u_{ijk} = \sum_{l=k}^K \sigma_{ijl}$. For compatibility of experiments, we scaled the u_{ijk} values such that the area below the utility function is equal to $\frac{1}{2}\bar{v}$, where \bar{v} is uniformly drawn from the set $\{1, \dots, 20\}$.

For $1NAD$, we considered K hyperplanes of the form $\sum_{j \in G} a_{ij}^k x_{ij} + b_i^k$ for each $i \in A$, and generated the coefficients a_{ij}^k by multiplying $\frac{2}{3}$ with a value uniformly drawn from the set $\{0, 1, \dots, 20\}$, and generated the intercept b_i^k by multiplying $\frac{1}{3}$ with a value uniformly drawn from the set $\{0, 1, \dots, 20\}$. If $b_i^k > 0$ for all k , then we randomly set one of them to 0.

Tables 4 and 5 present the computational results respectively for $1SAD$ and $1NAD$ across different choices of n and K using CP Algorithm 1. As expected, in both models, as K increases the problems become more challenging, yet the CP algorithm is able to find the optimal solution or yield a small optimality gap in both cases.

n	$K = 5$			$K = 10$		
	Time	Gap	Iter.	Time	Gap	Iter.
10	0.047	0.00%	135.7	0.039	0.00%	136.3
20	0.066	0.00%	136.1	0.116	0.00%	135.6
50	0.423	0.00%	136.9	0.849	0.00%	136.0
100	3.059	0.00%	137.7	9.751	0.00%	136.3
200	25.757	0.00%	138.0	61.285	0.00%	137.0
500	394.089	0.00%	139.0	993.659	0.00%	137.0
1000	2723.559	0.00%	140.0	3686.469	3.11%	17.8

Table 4: Computational results for $1SAD$

6.3 Computational Results for $1LF2G$

We generated random instances for $1LF2G$ in a similar manner to $1LF$. Because of the large number of variables (n^3) involved in this model, we conducted the experiments for up to $n = 200$ agents, results of which are presented in Table 6. The CP algorithm is able to solve all instances to optimality. We also observe that for the binary case, the algorithm only takes one iteration, which means the initial (integer) solution is the optimal solution.

n	$K = 5$			$K = 10$		
	Time	Gap	Iter.	Time	Gap	Iter.
10	0.005	0.00%	9.0	0.005	0.00%	8.3
20	0.017	0.00%	11.9	0.028	0.00%	7.7
50	0.123	0.00%	10.1	0.283	0.00%	7.7
100	1.133	0.00%	11.7	2.898	0.00%	8.6
200	28.187	0.00%	19.6	27.265	0.00%	7.8
500	2900.344	0.01%	54.0	1371.009	0.00%	8.8
1000	>3600.000	1.39%	2.6	>3600.000	3.02%	2.0

Table 5: Computational results for *INAD*

n	ρ	binary			nonbinary		
		Time	Gap	Iter.	Time	Gap	Iter.
10	0.05	0.097	0.00%	1	0.012	0.00%	7.8
	0.33	0.003	0.00%	1	0.006	0.00%	5.8
	0.67	0.000	0.00%	1	0.016	0.00%	5.6
20	0.05	0.062	0.00%	1	0.069	0.00%	9.0
	0.33	0.078	0.00%	1	0.097	0.00%	5.0
	0.67	0.093	0.00%	1	0.075	0.00%	4.4
50	0.05	2.697	0.00%	1	3.497	0.00%	5.0
	0.33	3.053	0.00%	1	2.857	0.00%	4.0
	0.67	4.206	0.00%	1	2.110	0.00%	3.6
100	0.05	35.578	0.00%	1	59.293	0.00%	4.8
	0.33	68.962	0.00%	1	30.478	0.00%	3.2
	0.67	118.131	0.00%	1	38.131	0.00%	1.4
200	0.05	715.271	0.00%	1	1178.849	0.00%	4.0
	0.33	3021.620	0.00%	1	705.385	0.00%	2.2
	0.67	2970.474	0.00%	1	1257.448	0.00%	1.0

Table 6: Computational results for *1LF2G*

7 Acknowledgement

The second author would like to thank Richard Zeckhauser for a very enlightening discussion on his “wish list” of models for matching markets. Several of the models considered in this paper have their origins in that discussion.

References

- [ACGH20] Rediet Abebe, Richard Cole, Vasilis Gkatzelis, and Jason D Hartline. A truthful cardinal mechanism for one-sided matching. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 2096–2113. SIAM, 2020.
- [BAN07] Walid Ben-Ameur and José Neto. Acceleration of cutting-plane and column generation algorithms: Applications to network design. *Networks: An International Journal*, 49(1):3–17, 2007.

- [Bir46] Garrett Birkhoff. Tres observaciones sobre el algebra lineal. *Univ. Nac. Tucuman, Ser. A*, 5:147–154, 1946.
- [BPR95] Saugata Basu, Richard Pollack, and MF Roy. A new algorithm to find a point in every cell defined by a family of polynomials. *Quantifier Elimination and Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition*, B. Caviness and J. Johnson eds., Springer-Verlag, to appear, 1995.
- [Bud11] Eric Budish. The combinatorial assignment problem: Approximate competitive equilibrium from equal incomes. *Journal of Political Economy*, 119(6):1061–1103, 2011.
- [CDG⁺17] Richard Cole, Nikhil Devanur, Vasilis Gkatzelis, Kamal Jain, Tung Mai, Vijay V Vazirani, and Sadra Yazdanbod. Convex program duality, Fisher markets, and Nash social welfare. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 459–460, 2017.
- [CG18] Richard Cole and Vasilis Gkatzelis. Approximating the Nash social welfare with indivisible items. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 47(3):1211–1236, 2018.
- [CKM⁺19] Ioannis Caragiannis, David Kurokawa, Hervé Moulin, Ariel D Procaccia, Nisarg Shah, and Junxing Wang. The unreasonable fairness of maximum Nash welfare. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation (TEAC)*, 7(3):1–32, 2019.
- [DK08] Nikhil R Devanur and Ravi Kannan. Market equilibria in polynomial time for fixed number of goods or agents. In *2008 49th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 45–53. IEEE, 2008.
- [EMZ19a] Federico Echenique, Antonio Miralles, and Jun Zhang. Constrained pseudo-market equilibrium. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05986*, 2019.
- [EMZ19b] Federico Echenique, Antonio Miralles, and Jun Zhang. Fairness and efficiency for probabilistic allocations with endowments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.04336*, 2019.
- [EY10] K. Etessami and M. Yannakakis. On the complexity of Nash equilibria and other fixed points. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(6):2531–2597, 2010.
- [FW56] Marguerite Frank and Philip Wolfe. An algorithm for quadratic programming. *Naval Res. Logis. Quart.*, 3(1-2):95–110, 1956.
- [GLS12] Martin Grötschel, László Lovász, and Alexander Schrijver. *Geometric algorithms and combinatorial optimization*, volume 2. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [GS62] David Gale and Lloyd S Shapley. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 69(1):9–15, 1962.
- [GTV20] Jugal Garg, Thorben Tröbst, and Vijay V Vazirani. An Arrow-Debreu extension of the hylland-zeckhauser scheme: Equilibrium existence and algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.10320*, 2020.
- [HMPY18] Yinghua He, Antonio Miralles, Marek Pycia, and Jianye Yan. A pseudo-market approach to allocation with priorities. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 10(3):272–314, 2018.

- [HZ79] Aanund Hylland and Richard Zeckhauser. The efficient allocation of individuals to positions. *Journal of Political economy*, 87(2):293–314, 1979.
- [Jag13] Martin Jaggi. Revisiting Frank-Wolfe: Projection-free sparse convex optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 427–435. PMLR, 2013.
- [Kel60] James E Kelley, Jr. The cutting-plane method for solving convex programs. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 8(4):703–712, 1960.
- [Le17] Phuong Le. Competitive equilibrium in the random assignment problem. *International Journal of Economic Theory*, 13(4):369–385, 2017.
- [McL18] Andy McLennan. Efficient disposal equilibria of pseudomarkets. In *Workshop on Game Theory*, volume 4, page 8, 2018.
- [Mou18] Hervé Moulin. Fair division in the age of internet. *Annual Review of Economics*, 2018.
- [Nas53] John Nash. Two-person cooperative games. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 128–140, 1953.
- [Vaz12] V. V. Vazirani. The notion of a rational convex program, and an algorithm for the Arrow-Debreu Nash bargaining game. *Journal of the ACM*, 59(2), 2012.
- [Vis21] Nisheeth Vishnoi. *Algorithms for Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2021. To appear.
- [VN53] John Von Neumann. A certain zero-sum two-person game equivalent to the optimal assignment problem. *Contributions to the Theory of Games*, 2(0):5–12, 1953.
- [VY21] Vijay V Vazirani and Mihalis Yannakakis. Computational complexity of the hylland-zeckhauser mechanism for one-sided matching markets. In *Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science*, 2021.