

Axiomatic Characterizations of Draft Rules*

Jacob Coreno & Ivan Balbuzanov[†]

May 14, 2024

Abstract

Drafts are sequential allocation procedures for distributing heterogeneous and indivisible objects among agents subject to some priority order (e.g., allocating players' contract rights to teams in professional sports leagues). Agents report ordinal preferences over objects and bundles are partially ordered by pairwise comparison. We provide a simple characterization of *draft rules*: they are the only allocation rules which are *respectful of a priority (RP)*, *envy-free up to one object (EF1)*, *non-wasteful (NW)* and *resource monotonic (RM)*. RP and EF1 are crucial for competitive balance in sports leagues. We also prove three related impossibility theorems showing that the competitive-balance axioms RP and EF1 are generally incompatible with *strategy-proofness*. However, draft rules satisfy *maxmin strategy-proofness*. If agents may declare some objects unacceptable, then draft rules are characterized by RP, EF1, NW, and RM, in conjunction with *individual rationality* and *truncation invariance*. In a model with variable populations, draft rules are characterized by EF1, EFF, and RM, together with *(population) consistency*, *top-object consistency*, and *neutrality*.

Keywords: matching theory; drafts; sequential allocation; multiple-object assignment problem; axiomatic characterization; envy-freeness up to one object.

JEL Classification: C78; D47; D71.

*We thank Jeff Borland, Haluk Ergin, Maciej Kotowski, Simon Loertscher, Robert Macdonald, Alexandru Nichifor, and Steven Williams for their very valuable feedback. We also thank conferences and seminar audiences at the 2022 SAET Conference, University of Queensland, 2023 Deakin Economic Theory Workshop, 3rd Padua Meeting of Economic Design, and Australian National University. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1928930, while Coreno was in residence at the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute in 2023.

[†]Department of Economics, Level 4, FBE Building, 111 Barry Street, University of Melbourne, Victoria 3010, Australia. Jacob Coreno: jacob.coreno@unimelb.edu.au. Ivan Balbuzanov: ivan.balbuzanov@unimelb.edu.au.

1 Introduction

A draft is a natural procedure for distributing heterogeneous and indivisible resources: agents take turns to select one object at a time, in an order specified by some priority, until all objects are gone (or all agents are satiated). Drafts are used in a variety of multiple-object assignment problems, such as the allocation of university courses (Budish and Cantillon, 2012) and political positions (O’Leary et al., 2005), divorce settlement (Willis, 1999), and estate division (Heath, 2018).¹ Undoubtedly, the most prominent application—and the most economically important one—is the annual draft of professional sports leagues, through which existing teams are assigned the rights to sign new players.

Drafts are used by the “Big Four” North American sports leagues, the National Football League (NFL), Major League Baseball (MLB), the National Basketball Association (NBA), and the National Hockey League, as well as other sports leagues in North America, Australia, and elsewhere. These leagues generate substantial revenues, attract significant interest and fan engagement from audiences, both live and TV,² and the teams that compete in them are extremely valuable.³

A unique attribute of professional sports leagues is that “competitors must be of approximately equal ‘size’ if any are to be successful” (Rottenberg, 1956, p. 242). The conventional wisdom is that closely contested matches with uncertain outcomes generate more spectator interest and, ultimately, larger profits. In line with this conventional wisdom, studies, starting with Schmidt and Berri (2001) and Humphreys (2002), have uncovered a positive empirical relationship between measures of *competitive balance* (i.e., minimizing the variance in league members’ competitive abilities) and average attendance.

Within this context, league officials and franchise owners see the draft as an important pillar of competitive balance (e.g., Grier and Tollison, 1994). Specifically, by giving the worst performing teams higher priority and the first choices in the draft, the best new talent is reserved for weaker teams, making them more competitive in subsequent seasons.⁴ Indeed, studies, such as Grier and Tollison (1994) and Butler (1995), empirically demonstrate the essential role that

¹Drafts typically see use in settings that value fair object allocation. See <https://www.onlinedraft.com/> for a variety of other applications.

²While NFL’s Super Bowl is typically the most watched TV program in the US, the NFL draft, held annually during the off-season, is a huge event in its own right. In April 2022, the three-day event amassed an average TV audience of 5.2 million, with over 10 million viewers tuning in for the first round. The NBA draft attracts similarly high viewership.

³Each of the North American Big Four is among the five leagues with the highest revenue in the world. The four of them enjoy a combined annual revenue of \$44 billion USD. The NFL’s 32 franchises have a combined market value of around \$163 billion USD, making it the most valuable league in the world (Ozanian, 2023).

⁴Another reason that the draft may appeal to team officials is that it minimizes inter-team competition for the most talented rookies and prevents bidding wars over the most desirable incoming players. A player that is new to a league may sign a contract only with the team that drafted him or her.

the draft plays in maintaining and promoting competitive balance. Yet there has been limited progress toward a solid theoretical understanding of how the properties of the draft, when viewed as a formal matching mechanism, promote competitive balance.

This paper analyzes drafts and competitive balance using an axiomatic approach. We focus on *draft rules*, which are centralized allocation rules that closely resemble the decentralized drafts used by professional sports leagues.^{5,6} More precisely, a draft rule allocates recruits to the teams over several rounds; each team is assigned one recruit per round, in an order specified by some priority ordering. We assume that each team has a total order over recruits, which generates a partial order over sets of recruits via pairwise comparison.⁷ Our main contributions are, to the best of our knowledge, the first axiomatic characterizations of draft rules: they are the only allocation rules satisfying

1. *respect for priority (RP)*, *envy-freeness up to one object (EF1)*, *resource monotonicity (RM)*, and *non-wastefulness (NW)*; or
2. *EF1*, *RM*, *Pareto efficiency (EFF)*, *population consistency (CON)*, *top-object consistency (T-CON)*, and *neutrality (NEU)*.

Our first characterization gives an axiomatic justification for the use of draft rules in professional sports leagues. The first two properties, RP and EF1, are closely tied to competitive balance. RP requires that there is a priority ordering over the teams such that each team prefers its own set of recruits to the set of recruits assigned to *any other team with lower priority*. RP can be viewed as a weak fairness property (as in [Svensson, 1994](#)) that guarantees the absence of justified envy ([Abdulkadiroğlu and Sönmez, 2003](#)). The class of allocation rules satisfying RP is large and includes draft rules (where, as is typically the case in sports leagues, the relevant priority is determined by reverse finishing order in the previous season—or by a weighted lottery

⁵In a (*centralized*) *allocation rule*, agents simultaneously report their preferences directly to a central authority, and the allocation is determined based on the reported preferences according to some rule or procedure. In contrast, a (*decentralized*) *draft* is an extensive-form mechanism in which agents choose objects sequentially, and the allocation is determined by the sequence of selections made by the agents. Our results pertain to centralized draft rules, which are simpler to analyze than their decentralized counterparts. Nevertheless, our results can also be applied to decentralized drafts, provided that teams always select their most-preferred player whenever they are called to pick.

⁶Note that this is a pure object-allocation problem and not a two-sided matching market. The problem is to allocate players' contract rights to teams rather than to match teams and players together as in centralized labor markets, such as the NRMP. Players' preferences over the teams are not used to determine the final allocation.

⁷That is, a team prefers set A over set B if there exists a one-to-one function from B to A that maps each element of B into a more-preferred element of A . Partial orders from pairwise comparison are similar to responsive preferences. The difference is that we do not require the existence of a complete preference order over the sets of recruits. Our assumption rules out complicated preferences over allocations, such as those exhibiting complementarities (e.g., “we want quarterback A only if we also get wide receiver B”).

based on this order) as well as *serial dictatorships*.⁸ Serial dictatorships are, however, highly inequitable. In particular, they can provide too much support for the weaker teams, making them far too strong in the following seasons.⁹

EF1 requires that any team prefers its own set of recruits to the set of recruits assigned to *any other team* after removing at most one player from the other team’s set. To see why the draft satisfies EF1, suppose that team i has picked players a_1 and a_2 with its 1st and 21st draft picks, respectively, while team j has picked players b_1 and b_2 with the 20th and 40th picks in the same draft, respectively. Team j may prefer i ’s allocation over its own (i.e., j may envy i) if, for example, they have the same preferences. If a_1 is removed from i ’s allocation set, however, j will cease envying i : it prefers its assigned bundle $\{b_1, b_2\}$ over $\{a_2\}$ because b_1 has been revealed preferred to a_2 .

EF1 rules out serial dictatorships, together with their associated problems: by limiting the extent to which low-priority teams can envy their high-priority rivals, EF1 ensures that high-priority teams are not favored too heavily. Intuitively, EF1 allocation rules can prevent drastic swings in team quality across seasons, allowing for some stability in year-to-year team rankings; they can also limit the incentives to “tank,” relative to other allocation rules satisfying RP.¹⁰

A non-wasteful allocation rule assigns all available players. The draft satisfies an even stronger efficiency criterion: it always selects an allocation which is *Pareto efficient (EFF)* with respect to the teams’ (partial) preferences over sets of recruits.¹¹ RM captures a notion of solidarity among the teams: it requires that, whenever the set of available recruits grows, all teams become weakly better off. The two supplementary properties, EFF and RM, are of secondary importance to sports leagues, but they are certainly appealing in other applications.

Although draft rules satisfy many appealing properties, they possess a fundamental defect: they are not *strategy-proof (SP)* as a team may benefit from picking insincerely if it knows that its most-preferred recruit will not be picked by other teams. It is therefore natural to ask whether there exists a strategy-proof allocation rule satisfying the competitive balance properties, RP

⁸A serial dictatorship works as follows: the first team is assigned its most preferred set of recruits; the second team is assigned its most preferred set of recruits among the pool of remaining recruits, and so on.

⁹For example, the 2003 NBA draft is known for producing one of the most talented cohorts of all time. Four of the top five picks, namely LeBron James, Carmelo Anthony, Chris Bosh, and Dwyane Wade, were NBA All-Stars. LeBron James, Dwyane Wade, and Chris Bosh became all-time scoring leaders for their respective teams after just their first seven seasons. The trio, who became known as the “Big Three”, united at the Miami Heat between 2010 and 2014; they led the Heat to the NBA Finals in each of their four seasons together, winning back-to-back championships in 2012 and 2013. If the NBA had instead used a serial dictatorship, the Cleveland Cavaliers—the worst performing team in the 2002-03 season—could have selected two members of the “Big Three” on their single turn, helping the team to immediate success.

¹⁰*Tanking* is the phenomenon in which sports teams deliberately lose matches in order to obtain higher priority in the next season’s draft. If the NBA had instead used a serial dictatorship in 2003, the prospect of drafting two members of the “Big Three” could have tempted many teams to throw games.

¹¹Draft rules are not efficient if teams have complete preferences over sets of recruits (Hatfield, 2009).

and EF1. This question is answered in the negative by three impossibility results. The main insight from Theorems 2, 3, and 4 is that every allocation rule satisfying the competitive balance properties, RP and EF1, possesses one of two defects: it is either manipulable or inefficient. Hence, a sports league can remedy the draft’s deficiencies only if it is willing to introduce another deficiency—one which is arguably more severe.

While draft rules are not strategy-proof, there are compelling reasons for teams to report their preferences truthfully. First, no team can profitably misrepresent its preferences at any problem instance in which all rival teams share the same preferences. More generally, Theorem 5 shows that, if teams have *additive* preferences,¹² then truthful reporting is a utility maximizer in the revelation game associated with any draft rule. In other words, draft rules are *maxmin strategy-proof (MSP)*. Truth-telling is optimal when agents are maxmin expected utility maximizers and they are uncertain (in the Knightian sense) about the other teams’ preferences (Gilboa and Schmeidler, 1989). As a corollary of Theorem 5, it follows that, even though there may exist a strategic manipulation that benefits a given team, any such manipulations are non-obvious and, therefore, draft rules are not obviously manipulable in the sense of Troyan and Morrill (2020).

Our second characterization provides an alternative justification for the use of draft rules in environments where the set of agents can vary. Interestingly, this characterization does not use RP and highlights the usefulness of draft rules even in settings where there is no natural priority order over the agents. CON requires that, whenever some allocation $A = (A_i)_{i \in N}$ is selected for some problem involving a group N of agents, and I is a subgroup of N , the rule prescribes the restriction $A_I = (A_i)_{i \in I}$ of A to I when facing the subproblem involving only the agents in I and the objects allocated to I under A . CON is standard in the literature (see, e.g., Ergin, 2000; Thomson, 2011, 2012). Intuitively, it implies a form of robustness to nonsimultaneous processing of the *agents*. T-CON, on the other hand, implies a form of robustness to nonsimultaneous processing of the *objects*. Formally, an allocation rule satisfies T-CON if, whenever some allocation $A = (A_i)_{i \in N}$ is selected for some problem involving a set of objects X , and x_i denotes agent i ’s best object in A_i , the rule prescribes the allocation $B = (A_i \setminus \{x_i\})_{i \in N}$ for the subproblem involving the subset of objects $X \setminus \bigcup_{i \in N} \{x_i\}$. NEU requires that all objects are treated symmetrically; in the context of sports leagues, where the objects are recruits, it implies a form of fairness in the treatment of the *players*.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 1.1 gives an overview of the related literature. Section 2.1 introduces the standard model, in which allocation rules are formally defined, and we discuss how to extend agents’ preferences over objects to incomplete preferences

¹²An agent has additive preferences if its preferences over bundles are represented by an additive utility function. See footnote 16 for a definition of additive utility functions.

over bundles (e.g., *sets of recruits*) using the pairwise dominance extension (see, for example, [Brams and Straffin, 1979](#)). Section 2.2 defines several properties of allocation rules and highlights some useful relationships between the properties. Section 2.3 provides a formal definition of draft rules. Section 2.4 states the main results of the paper. Section 3 presents two extensions and the corresponding characterisation results. The first extension considers environments where each agent demands a number of objects less than or equal to some (possibly agent-specific) quota. The second extension considers a more general preference domain, in which agents may deem certain objects unacceptable. In Section 4, we consider a model in which the set of agents may vary. Section 5 concludes. All proofs are postponed to the appendix.

1.1 Related Literature

[Rottenberg \(1956\)](#) and [Neale \(1964\)](#) were among the first to highlight the importance of competitive balance in sports leagues. [Borland and Macdonald \(2003\)](#) provide an excellent review of the literature, and they discuss the connection between competitive balance and spectator demand. [Humphreys \(2002\)](#) introduces a long-run measure of competitive balance and shows that this measure is a significant determinant of total annual attendance in MLB. Several important papers are devoted to empirically evaluating the impact that drafts have on competitive balance. For instance, [Grier and Tollison \(1994\)](#) show that earlier picks in the NFL draft are associated with better performance in subsequent seasons, and [Butler \(1995\)](#) shows that the MLB draft has significantly reduced the within-season dispersion of winning percentages.

[Kohler and Chandrasekaran \(1971\)](#) provided one of the earliest theoretical studies of drafts. It gives an algorithm for constructing the Nash equilibrium in a drafting game with two teams. [Brams and Straffin \(1979\)](#) show that, with only two teams, the Nash equilibrium strategies produce an allocation which is Pareto efficient with respect to pairwise comparison; however, this is not necessarily true when there are three or more teams. [Brams and King \(2005\)](#) show that an allocation is efficient if and only if it is the outcome of a draft rule associated with some picking sequence. [Caragiannis et al. \(2019\)](#) point out that draft rules satisfy a version of EF1 when agents have additive preferences. It is well-known that draft rules are manipulable (e.g., [Kohler and Chandrasekaran, 1971](#); [Hatfield, 2009](#)). [Bouveret and Lang \(2011, 2014\)](#) study the problem of computing optimal manipulations, while [Aziz et al. \(2017\)](#) consider the computational complexity of such problems.

[Budish and Cantillon \(2012\)](#) study a version of a draft mechanism, with a randomly drawn initial priority that reverses after each round, which is used to allocate courses to students at the Harvard Business School. Although the mechanism is manipulable, they show that the HBS mechanism generates more ex ante welfare than its strategy-proof counterpart, the *random serial dictatorship (RSD)*. [Biró et al. \(2022b\)](#) study *Single-Serial* rules, which are equivalent to

draft rules with agent-specific quotas. Single-Serial rules are shown to be *ig-Pareto-efficient*, equivalent to EFF in our model, as well as *truncation-proof*. (See also [Biró et al., 2022a](#).) [Caspari \(2022\)](#) analyzes a related allocation rule, called a *booster draft*. In a booster draft with n agents, the objects are partitioned into m sets of size n (called *boosters*), and each agent picks once from each of the m sets. Since an agent’s choice from one booster does not impact the set of objects available to her in another booster, the rule is strategy-proof. However, booster drafts are not efficient.

Our characterization results complement existing characterizations of alternative allocation rules for the multiple-object assignment problem. For example, [Pápai \(2001\)](#), [Ehlers and Klaus \(2003\)](#), and [Hatfield \(2009\)](#) show, on various preference domains, that sequential dictatorships¹³ are characterized by appropriate notions of efficiency, strategy-proofness, and non-bossiness. In each of those papers, imposing further requirements (e.g., neutrality in [Hatfield, 2009](#)) pins down the class of serial dictatorships (see also [Pápai, 2000](#)).

The properties we consider are mostly familiar, but they have been adapted or extended to our setting. Many mechanisms allocate objects to agents on the basis of priorities. For the class of *single-unit* problems, where each agent is assigned a single object, [Svensson \(1994\)](#) considers a version of RP (which he calls *weak fairness*) and constructs a mechanism satisfying RP, EFF, and SP on the full preference domain. [Ergin \(2000, Lemma 1\)](#) shows that this property, together with EFF, fully characterizes serial dictatorships in the single-unit setting with strict preferences. Our version of RP is the natural extension of [Svensson’s \(1994\)](#) property to multiple-object problems. Another related property is *no justified envy (NJE)*, which is a desideratum for school-choice mechanisms ([Abdulkadiroğlu and Sönmez, 2003](#)): both properties forbid envy towards an agent with lower priority. The difference is that NJE arises in problems with unit demand and local (i.e., school-specific), rather than global, priority orders.

EF1 has its roots in the work of [Lipton et al. \(2004\)](#), but the version we use is adapted from [Budish \(2011\)](#). [Budish \(2011\)](#) considers complete preferences over bundles, whereas our EF1 is based on the pairwise dominance extension. Our efficiency criterion, Pareto efficiency with respect to pairwise dominance, is identical to that of [Brams and Straffin \(1979\)](#) and [Brams and King \(2005\)](#); it is weaker than the efficiency criteria considered by [Ehlers and Klaus \(2003\)](#) and [Hatfield \(2009\)](#), where agents are assumed to have complete responsive preferences over bundles. [Ehlers and Klaus \(2003\)](#) consider a version of resource monotonicity; their version is more permissive than our RM, since they do not require that each finite subset of potential

¹³In a sequential dictatorship, a first dictator is assigned her most-preferred bundle from the entire set of objects. Then, a second dictator, whose identity may depend on the first dictator’s assigned bundle, chooses his most-preferred bundle from the set of remaining objects; the third dictator is determined by the previous dictators’ assigned bundles, and so on. If the order of dictators is the same for all preference profiles, then the sequential dictatorship is called a *serial dictatorship*.

objects is an admissible set of available objects. Truncation invariance is common in settings where objects to be allocated may be unacceptable to some agents. It is used by [Ehlers and Klaus \(2014\)](#) to characterize Deferred Acceptance, and by [Hashimoto et al. \(2014\)](#) to characterize the Probabilistic Serial rule. Consistency and neutrality are used, for example, by [Ergin \(2000\)](#) to characterize serial dictatorships in the single-unit setting.

Our impossibility theorems parallel existing results that highlight the tension between three ideal desiderata: efficiency, fairness, and incentive compatibility. For example, our Theorem 3 is similar to Proposition 3 of [Budish \(2011\)](#), which states that strategy-proofness is incompatible with efficiency and envy-freeness up to one object in his model. [Caspari \(2022\)](#) proves a related result, which says that, with a fixed set of available objects, strategy-proofness is incompatible with efficiency and *envy-freeness up to k objects*, for some k that depends on the number of objects available.

2 Fixed Populations

2.1 Model

We consider the problem of allocating bundles of heterogeneous and indivisible objects to members of a fixed population of n agents. Let $N := \{1, \dots, n\}$ denote the fixed set of *agents*, where $n \geq 2$. The set of objects available to the agents can change. Let \mathbb{O} denote the set of potential *objects*, where \mathbb{O} is assumed to be countably infinite. Let $\mathcal{X} := \{X \subseteq \mathbb{O} \mid 0 < |X| < \infty\}$ denote the family of sets of *available objects*, which are finite nonempty subsets of \mathbb{O} .

A (*strict*) *preference* \succeq_i for agent i is a complete, transitive and antisymmetric binary relation on \mathbb{O} . We write \succ_i for the asymmetric part of \succeq_i , i.e., for all $x, y \in \mathbb{O}$, $x \succ_i y$ if and only if $x \succeq_i y$ and $x \neq y$. Let \mathcal{R} denote the set of all preferences. The set of all preference profiles $\succeq = (\succeq_i)_{i \in N}$ is denoted by \mathcal{R}^N .

Given a nonempty set $X \subseteq \mathbb{O}$ and a preference relation $\succeq_i \in \mathcal{R}$, we denote by $\succeq_i|_X$ the restriction of \succeq_i to the set X . If, for example, $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$ and $x_1 \succ_i x_2 \succ_i \dots \succ_i x_k$, then we will sometimes use shorthand notation such as $X = \{x_1 \succ_i x_2 \succ_i \dots \succ_i x_k\}$ or $\succeq_i|_X = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k$. If, in addition, $x \in X$ and $y \in \mathbb{O} \setminus X$ implies $x \succ_i y$, then we may write $\succeq_i = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k, \dots$. If $X \in \mathcal{X}$, then $\text{top}_{\succeq_i}(X)$ denotes the top-ranked object according to \succeq_i ; that is, $\text{top}_{\succeq_i}(X) = x$ if and only if $x \in X$ and $x \succeq_i y$ for all $y \in X$. Moreover, given $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, |X|\}$, let $\text{top}_{\succeq_i}(X, k)$ denote the set consisting of the k top-ranked objects in X (which is empty if $k = 0$).

A *bundle* is a finite subset of \mathbb{O} , which is possibly empty. The set of all bundles is denoted $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{X} \cup \{\emptyset\}$. An *allocation* $A = (A_i)_{i \in N}$ is a profile of disjoint bundles, where A_i is the bundle

of objects assigned to agent i . Let \mathcal{A} denote the set of all allocations. For each $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{A}(X)$ denotes the subset of \mathcal{A} consisting of all allocations $A = (A_i)_{i \in N}$ satisfying $\bigcup_{i \in N} A_i \subseteq X$. A *problem* is a pair $(\succeq, X) \in \mathcal{R}^N \times \mathcal{X}$. An *allocation rule* is a function $\varphi : \mathcal{R}^N \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that $\varphi(\succeq, X) \in \mathcal{A}(X)$.¹⁴ We emphasize that the allocation rules considered in this paper are defined over preference profiles on the set of *objects*, rather than an alternative domain consisting of preference profiles on the set of *bundles*. The latter domain is much richer but would impose significant complexity costs to participants.

To facilitate meaningful comparisons of allocation rules, agents' preferences are extended from objects to bundles via pairwise dominance (Brams and Straffin, 1979). Formally, the *pairwise dominance extension* \succeq_i^{PD} of a preference relation \succeq_i is defined as follows: for all $S, T \in \mathcal{B}$, $S \succeq_i^{PD} T$ if and only if there is an injection $\mu : T \rightarrow S$ such that $\mu(x) \succeq_i x$ for each $x \in T$. The relation \succeq_i^{PD} is a partial order on \mathcal{B} . Denote by \succ_i^{PD} the asymmetric part of \succeq_i^{PD} . We view \succeq_i^{PD} as agent i 's (incomplete) ranking over \mathcal{B} when her preference relation is \succeq_i . Consequently, if $S \succeq_i^{PD} T$, then we may use terminology such as *S is at least as good as T for agent i*. Similarly, if $S \succ_i^{PD} T$, then we may say that *agent i prefers S to T* or that *S is better than T for i*. Note in particular that, for any $S, T \in \mathcal{B}$ with $T \subseteq S$, one has $S \succeq_i^{PD} T$. This reflects the assumption, maintained throughout this section, that agents' preferences exhibit non-satiation or that "more is better" (i.e., all agents prefer a bundle over any of its subsets). In the context of sports drafts, contract rights typically have positive option value and free disposal: i.e., a team can choose to not sign players it has drafted and instead retain their contract rights as a tradeable asset. As discussed in footnote 7, the assumption that agents compare bundles by pairwise dominance rules out preferences exhibiting "complementarities."¹⁵

The pairwise dominance extension \succeq_i^{PD} is equivalent to the responsive set extension (Roth, 1985). Hence, for each $S \in \mathcal{B}$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{O} \setminus S$, it holds that

$$S \cup \{x\} \succ_i^{PD} S, \tag{1}$$

$$\text{and } x \succeq_i y \implies S \cup \{x\} \succeq_i^{PD} S \cup \{y\}. \tag{2}$$

In fact, the responsive set extension \succeq_i^{RS} is the transitive closure of all the relations given in (1) and (2). Moreover, \succeq_i^{PD} is equivalent to the additive utility extension. That is, given bundles $S, T \in \mathcal{B}$, $S \succeq_i^{PD} T$ if and only if $u_i(S) \geq u_i(T)$ for every additive utility function $u_i : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

¹⁴To simplify notation, we allow agents to express preferences over all objects in \mathbb{O} , even though the set X of available objects is a proper subset of \mathbb{O} .

¹⁵For instance, if x, y, z are distinct objects and P_i is a strict total order on \mathcal{B} , then it is conceivable that $\{x\} P_i \{y\} P_i \{z\}$ and $\{x, z\} P_i \{x, y\}$. This can happen if, for example, x and y are (mutually substitutable) NFL quarterbacks, while z is a wide receiver, a position that is complementary to the quarterback. However, if $x \succ_i y \succ_i z$, then agent i necessarily prefers $\{x, y\}$ to $\{x, z\}$ in our model.

consistent with \succeq_i .¹⁶

2.2 Properties of Allocation Rules

2.2.1 Fairness and Competitive Balance

Given an allocation A and a preference profile \succeq , we say agent i envies agent j if $A_i \not\prec_i^{PD} A_j$. In light of the equivalence between the pairwise dominance extension and the additive utility extension, agent i envies agent j if and only if $u_i(A_j) > u_i(A_i)$ for some additive utility function $u_i : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ consistent with \succeq_i .¹⁷ The following property, which captures a very strong notion of fairness, requires that no agent envies any other agent.

Property 1. An allocation rule φ is *envy-free (EF)* if, for any problem (\succeq, X) and any agents $i, j \in N$, $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_j(\succeq, X)$.

While envy-freeness is an appealing property, it is far too demanding in our setting. It is easy to see that every envy-free allocation rule is wasteful. In particular, envy-free allocation rules allocate the empty bundle to each agent whenever agents have the same preferences. Furthermore, an envy-free allocation rule would do little to correct competitive imbalances. Insofar as each team's preference over players is based on the players' ability to contribute to the team's victory probability, an envy-free rule is likely to perpetuate the dominance of already successful teams. We therefore consider two weaker notions of fairness.

The first weakening of envy-freeness permits envy between certain agents. There are many practical settings in which envy between some agents may be desirable to a market designer. For instance, sports leagues seek to allocate the best new players to weaker teams in order to promote a more balanced competition, and students with the highest exam scores enjoy the highest priority for school seats (Abdulkadiroğlu and Sönmez, 2003). While such practices violate envy-freeness, they are generally considered fair. To model these situations, we introduce a priority ordering over the agents as follows. A *priority* is a bijection $\pi : N \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$. We say that agent i has higher priority than agent j if $\pi(i) < \pi(j)$. The following property requires that no agent envies an agent with lower priority.

Property 2. An allocation rule φ is *respectful of the priority π (RP- π)* if, for any problem (\succeq, X) and any agent $i \in N$,

$$\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_j(\succeq, X) \text{ for each } j \in N \text{ such that } \pi(i) < \pi(j).$$

¹⁶A utility function $u_i : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *additive* if, for all $X \in \mathcal{B}$, $u_i(X) = \sum_{x \in X} u_i(\{x\})$, where it is understood that $u_i(\emptyset) = 0$. We say that u_i is *consistent with \succeq_i* if (i) $u_i(\{x\}) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{O}$ and (ii) $u_i(\{x\}) \geq u_i(\{y\})$ if and only if $x \succeq_i y$.

¹⁷Strictly speaking, $A_i \not\prec_i^{PD} A_j$ implies only that envy is *possible* with respect to some additive utility representation. Still, for simplicity we will refer to i envying j , rather than employ a more awkward construction.

An allocation rule φ is *respectful of a priority (RP)* if there exists a priority π such that φ satisfies RP- π .

The following weakening of RP concerns only the relative sizes of the agents' assigned bundles. It suffices for the majority of our results and we mostly work with it in the rest of the paper.

Property 3. An allocation rule φ is *weakly respectful of the priority π (WRP- π)* if, for any problem (\succeq, X) and any agent $i \in N$,

$$|\varphi_i(\succeq, X)| \geq |\varphi_j(\succeq, X)| \text{ for each } j \in N \text{ such that } \pi(i) < \pi(j).$$

An allocation rule φ is *weakly respectful of a priority (WRP)* if there exists a priority π such that φ satisfies WRP- π .

If φ is an allocation rule that respects the priority π , then it is possible that an agent j envies another agent i with higher priority. The second weakening of envy-freeness requires that the degree of any envy is not “too large” in the following sense: if agent j envies agent i , then this envy can be eliminated by removing exactly one object from agent i 's bundle.

Property 4. An allocation rule φ is *envy-free up to one object (EF1)* if, for any problem (\succeq, X) and agents $i, j \in N$, there exists $S \subseteq \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$ such that $|S| \leq 1$ and $\varphi_j(\succeq, X) \succeq_j^{PD} \varphi_i(\succeq, X) \setminus S$.

It is easy to see that EF implies EF1, RP and WRP, but the converse is false. On the other hand, EF1 is logically independent from both RP and WRP.

2.2.2 Efficiency

An allocation $A \in \mathcal{A}(X)$ is *efficient at (\succeq, X)* if there is no allocation $B \in \mathcal{A}(X)$ such that $B \neq A$ and $B_i \succeq_i^{PD} A_i$ for each $i \in N$. The strongest efficiency property that we consider is the following.

Property 5. An allocation rule φ is *efficient (EFF)* if, for any problem (\succeq, X) , $\varphi(\succeq, X)$ is efficient at (\succeq, X) .

In what follows, we identify two properties that are necessary and sufficient for efficiency. Given an allocation $A \in \mathcal{A}$, let $|A|$ denote the *size* of A , i.e., $|A| = |\bigcup_{i \in N} A_i| = \sum_{i \in N} |A_i|$. The next property is a minimal requirement for efficiency.

Property 6. An allocation rule φ is *non-wasteful (NW)* if, for any problem (\succeq, X) , $|\varphi(\succeq, X)| = |X|$.

We say that an allocation rule φ is *wasteful* if it violates NW. Given a preference profile $\succeq \in \mathcal{R}^N$ and an allocation $A \in \mathcal{A}$, we define a binary relation $\blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, A)}$ on $N \times \mathbb{O}$ as follows:

$$(i, x) \blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, A)} (j, y) \iff x \in A_i, y \succ_i x \text{ and } i \neq j.$$

If the binary relation $\blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, A)}$ contains a cycle, say

$$(i_1, x_1) \blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, A)} (i_2, x_2) \blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, A)} \cdots \blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, A)} (i_k, x_k) \blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, A)} (i_1, x_1), \quad (3)$$

then the multilateral exchange in which agent i_ℓ gives up object x_ℓ and receives object $x_{\ell+1}$ (with subscripts interpreted modulo k), makes each of the agents i_1, \dots, i_k strictly better off in a pairwise dominance sense. If, on the other hand, $\blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, A)}$ contains no cycles, then we shall call $\blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, A)}$ *acyclic*. The final efficiency property requires that agents can never improve upon their allocation by engaging in multilateral single-object trades.

Property 7. An allocation rule φ is *robust against trades (RT)* if, for any problem (\succeq, X) , the binary relation $\blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, \varphi(\succeq, X))}$ is acyclic.

It is clear that any efficient allocation rule is non-wasteful and robust against trades. Proposition 1 supplies the converse.¹⁸

Proposition 1. *An allocation rule φ satisfies EFF if and only if it satisfies NW and RT.*

It is worth noting that, by contrast, RP, EF1, and NW, do not jointly imply EFF. To see this, suppose $N = \{1, 2\}$, $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$ and preferences satisfying

$$\succeq_1|_X = a, b, c, d; \quad \succeq_2|_X = d, c, b, a.$$

The outcome $(\{a, c\}, \{b, d\})$ is EF (and, therefore, also RP and EF1) and NW but not EFF as it is dominated by $(\{a, b\}, \{c, d\})$.

The following lemma provides a convenient property of allocation rules satisfying WRP- π and EF1, and is useful in proving our main characterization result. Namely, for any allocation chosen by a rule satisfying WRP- π and EF1, there is an agent, who is critical in the sense that she is assigned the same number of objects as any agent ahead of her in the priority order and exactly one more object than any agent behind her in that order.

Lemma 1. *Suppose φ is an allocation rule satisfying WRP- π , and EF1. Then, for each problem*

¹⁸A similar result was obtained independently in Caspari (2022).

(\succeq, X) , there is some agent $i \in N$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi_j(\succeq, X)| &= |\varphi_i(\succeq, X)| \text{ whenever } \pi(j) \leq \pi(i) \\ \text{and } |\varphi_j(\succeq, X)| &= |\varphi_i(\succeq, X)| - 1 \text{ whenever } \pi(j) > \pi(i). \end{aligned}$$

2.2.3 Resource Monotonicity

Recall that an allocation rule φ specifies an allocation $\varphi(\succeq, X)$ for every problem (\succeq, X) , where X is any set of available objects drawn from \mathcal{X} . The following property requires, loosely speaking, that monotonic changes in the set of available objects are associated with monotonic changes in the welfare of every agent. Specifically, whenever the set of available objects grows (shrinks), all agents receive a weakly better (worse) bundle. [Chun and Thomson \(1988\)](#) and [Moulin and Thomson \(1988\)](#) offered some of the earliest analyses of rules satisfying this property.

Property 8. An allocation rule φ is *resource monotonic (RM)* if, for any $X, X' \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\succeq \in \mathcal{R}^N$,

$$X \supseteq X' \implies \varphi_i(\succeq, X) \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_i(\succeq, X') \text{ for all } i \in N.$$

2.2.4 Incentive Compatibility

This section introduces three incentive compatibility properties. For a preference profile \succeq and a preference relation \succeq'_i of agent i , let $(\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i})$ denote the preference profile in which agent i 's preference is \succeq'_i and, for each agent $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$, agent j 's preference is \succeq_j . An allocation rule is *strategy-proof* if, by reporting her preferences truthfully, each agent always obtains a bundle which is at least as good as any bundle she can obtain by misrepresenting her preferences.

Property 9. An allocation rule φ is *strategy-proof (SP)* if, for any problem (\succeq, X) and $i \in N$,

$$\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_i((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X) \text{ for all } \succeq'_i \in \mathcal{R}.$$

An allocation rule is *weakly strategy-proof* if, by misrepresenting her preferences, no agent can obtain a bundle which is strictly better than the bundle she obtains by reporting her preferences truthfully.

Property 10. An allocation rule φ is *weakly strategy-proof (WSP)* if, for any problem (\succeq, X) and $i \in N$, there is no $\succeq'_i \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $\varphi_i((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X) \succ_i^{PD} \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$.

SP and WSP are well-studied properties with the usual interpretation. The definitions given here are natural for settings in which agents partially order the set of alternatives (see

Bogomolnaia and Moulin, 2001 for a classic example where the alternatives are lotteries, partially ordered by *first-order stochastic dominance*). Clearly, SP implies WSP but the converse is false.

Our third property is also weaker than SP but it is nevertheless a compelling notion of incentive compatibility: an allocation rule is *maxmin strategy-proof (MSP)* if truthful reporting is a utility maximizer whenever agents have additive preferences. In other words, truth-telling is optimal when agents are maxmin expected utility maximizers and face substantial uncertainty about the other agents' preferences (Gilboa and Schmeidler, 1989).

Property 11. An allocation rule φ is *maxmin strategy-proof (MSP)* if, for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $i \in N$, $\succeq_i \in \mathcal{R}$,

$$\succeq_i \in \arg \max_{\succeq'_i \in \mathcal{R}} \left[\min_{\succeq'_{-i} \in \mathcal{R}^{N \setminus i}} u_i \left(\varphi_i \left((\succeq'_i, \succeq'_{-i}), X \right) \right) \right] \quad (4)$$

for every additive utility function u_i consistent with \succeq_i .

It is clear that SP implies MSP but the converse is false. One can show that WSP and MSP are logically independent.

2.3 Draft Rules

A *picking sequence* is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow N$, where $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$. The *draft rule associated with f* is the allocation rule $\varphi^f : \mathcal{R}^N \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ which assigns agents their favorite remaining object, one at a time, in the order prescribed by f . More precisely, to each problem (\succeq, X) , φ^f associates the allocation $\varphi^f(\succeq, X) \in \mathcal{A}(X)$ determined by the following procedure.

Algorithm 1: DRAFT(\succeq, X, f).

Input: A problem (\succeq, X) and a picking sequence f .

Output: An allocation $\varphi^f(\succeq, X) \in \mathcal{A}(X)$.

1. Define the sequence $(s_k)_{k=1}^{|X|}$ of *selections* recursively. Set:
 - (a) $s_1 = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f(1)}}(X)$.
 - (b) for $k = 2, \dots, |X|$, $s_k = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f(k)}}(X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\})$.
2. For each $i \in N$, set $\varphi_i^f(\succeq, X) = \{s_k \mid f(k) = i, 1 \leq k \leq |X|\}$.
3. Return $\varphi^f(\succeq, X) = (\varphi_i^f(\succeq, X))_{i \in N}$.

Given a priority π , let $f^\pi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow N$ denote the *picking sequence associated with π* , defined by

$$(f^\pi(k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = \left(\underbrace{\pi^{-1}(1), \pi^{-1}(2), \dots, \pi^{-1}(n)}_{\text{round 1}}, \underbrace{\pi^{-1}(1), \pi^{-2}(2), \dots, \pi^{-1}(n)}_{\text{round 2}}, \dots \right).$$

The *draft rule associated with π* is the allocation rule $\varphi^\pi := \varphi^{f^\pi}$. If an allocation rule φ satisfies $\varphi = \varphi^\pi$ for some priority π , then we shall call φ a *draft rule*.

The next lemma gives a useful property of resource monotonic allocation rules. It says that, if φ is resource monotonic and agrees with φ^f at (\succeq, X) for some picking sequence f , then, whenever we add to the set X of available objects an object x which is worse for each agent than any object assigned to her at (\succeq, X) , the bundles assigned to the agents at the problems (\succeq, X) and $(\succeq, X \cup \{x\})$ differ by at most $\{x\}$ (and, thus, all but one of the agents receive the same bundle).

Lemma 2. *Suppose φ is an allocation rule satisfying RM. Consider a problem (\succeq, X) such that $\varphi(\succeq, X) = \varphi^f(\succeq, X)$ for some picking sequence f . Let $x \in \mathbb{O} \setminus X$ satisfy $y \succ_i x$ for each $i \in N$ and each $y \in \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$. Then $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \subseteq \varphi_i(\succeq, X \cup \{x\})$ for each agent $i \in N$.*

2.4 Results

2.4.1 Characterization Result

Brams and King (2005, Proposition 1) show that an allocation is efficient if and only if it is the outcome of the draft rule associated with some picking sequence. That is, if $A = (A_i)_{i \in N}$ is an allocation and $X = \bigcup_{i \in N} A_i$, then A is efficient at (\succeq, X) if and only if there exists a picking sequence f such that $A = \varphi^f(\succeq, X)$. In particular, any draft rule φ^π is an efficient allocation rule. Proposition 1 implies that φ^π also satisfies RT and, hence, post-draft trading of players' contract rights cannot improve upon the outcome of a draft rule. This result relies on our use of pairwise dominance to generate a partial order over bundles that does not exhibit complementarities. It is easy to see that if preferences were complete (Hatfield, 2009) or not substitutable, there may be scope for ex post Pareto-improving trades. While teams commonly trade newly drafted players, we are not aware of any trades that are straight swaps of two newly acquired players for each other. All such trades include other assets, such as veteran players, future draft picks, or cash considerations.¹⁹ This suggests that, as long as teams make their

¹⁹Occasionally, a team would trade one of their draft acquisitions for *two* newly drafted players from another team. The most famous example is probably the 1998 swap of Robert Traylor from the Dallas Mavericks for Dirk Nowitzki and Pat Garrity from the Milwaukee Bucks, all newly drafted in that year's NBA draft. Such trades do not violate RT. This is because a cycle in $\blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, A)}$, as in (3), implies that each team relinquishes as

picks according to their true preferences over players in the draft, our model of their preferences over bundles is a good approximation of reality. The next result shows that φ^π satisfies other appealing properties.

Proposition 2. *For any priority π , the draft rule associated with π satisfies RP- π , EF1, EFF, and RM.*

Since efficient allocation rules are non-wasteful, the draft rule φ^π satisfies RP- π , EF1, NW, and RM. In fact, φ^π is the *unique* allocation rule satisfying these properties.

Theorem 1. *An allocation rule φ satisfies WRP- π , EF1, NW, and RM if and only if it is the draft rule associated with π . A fortiori, the draft rule associated with π is the unique allocation rule satisfying RP- π , EF1, NW, and RM.*

The following example illustrates the main ideas of the proof of Theorem 1.

Example 1. Suppose there are three agents, $N = \{1, 2, 3\}$, and four available objects, say $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$. Consider a preference profile $\succeq \in \mathcal{R}^N$ satisfying

$$\succeq_1|_X = a, b, c, d; \quad \succeq_2|_X = c, d, b, a; \quad \succeq_3|_X = a, d, c, b.$$

Letting π denote the identity priority (i.e., $\pi(i) = i$ for each $i \in N$), we will show that any allocation rule φ satisfying NW, WRP- π , EF1, and RM must satisfy $\varphi(\succeq, X) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, X) = (\{a, b\}, \{c\}, \{d\})$. The main idea of the proof is to inductively consider a sequence of sets of available objects: starting from the empty set, we add objects from X , one at a time, according to the order in which they are selected in the draft procedure $\text{DRAFT}(\succeq, X, f^\pi)$. We then show that, for each of the subsets of available objects S_k , where $\emptyset \subsetneq S_1 \subsetneq S_2 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq S_{|X|} = X$, one has $\varphi(\succeq, S_k) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, S_k)$.

The sequence of selections associated with the draft procedure $\text{DRAFT}(\succeq, X, f^\pi)$ is $(s_k)_{k=1}^{|X|} = (a, c, d, b)$. For each $k = 1, \dots, |X|$, we define $S_k = \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$:

$$S_1 = \{a\}, \quad S_2 = \{a, c\}, \quad S_3 = \{a, c, d\}, \quad S_4 = \{a, b, c, d\}.$$

We make the following observations:

1. $\varphi(\succeq, S_1) = (\{a\}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$.

By NW, object a must be assigned to some agent; by WRP- π , it must be assigned to agent 1.

many players as it acquires.

2. $\varphi(\succeq, S_2) = (\{a\}, \{c\}, \emptyset)$.

By Lemma 2 and RM, object a must be assigned to agent 1. By Lemma 1, WRP- π , and EF1, object c is assigned to agent 2.

3. $\varphi(\succeq, S_3) = (\{a\}, \{c\}, \{d\})$.

By Lemma 2 and RM, objects a and c must be assigned to agents 1 and 2, respectively. By Lemma 1, WRP- π , and EF1, object d is assigned to agent 3.

4. $\varphi(\succeq, S_4) = (\{a, b\}, \{c\}, \{d\})$.

By Lemma 2 and RM, objects a , c , and d must be assigned to agents 1, 2, and 3, respectively. By Lemma 1, WRP- π , and EF1, object b is assigned to agent 1.

These observations demonstrate that $\varphi(\succeq, S_k) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, S_k)$ for each $k = 1, \dots, |X|$ and, in particular, that $\varphi(\succeq, X) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, X)$. The proof of the general result extends the preceding argument to show that $\varphi(\succeq', X') = \varphi^\pi(\succeq', X')$ for *any* problem (\succeq', X') . \diamond

Proposition 2 and Theorem 1 show that the draft rule φ^π is fully characterized by WRP- π , EF1, RM, and NW. The four properties in Theorem 1 are independent of one another. To verify that a each property is not implied by the remaining three properties, we give an example of an allocation rule which satisfies the remaining properties but is not a draft rule.

Non-wasteful (NW). Let φ denote the *null rule*, defined by $\varphi(\succeq, X) = (\emptyset)_{i \in N}$ for each problem (\succeq, X) . Then φ satisfies RP- π (and WRP- π) for any priority π , EF1, and RM, but it violates NW.

Envy-free up to one object (EF1). Given any priority π , let φ denote the *π -dictatorship rule*, defined by $\varphi_{\pi^{-1}(1)}(\succeq, X) = X$ and $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) = \emptyset$ for each $i \neq \pi^{-1}(1)$. Then φ satisfies EFF (and NW), RP- π (and WRP- π), and RM, but not EF1.

Weakly respectful of a priority (WRP). Let π_1 and π_2 be distinct priorities. Let \succeq' be any preference profile in which all agents have the same preferences. If φ is the allocation rule defined by

$$\varphi(\succeq, X) = \begin{cases} \varphi^{\pi_1}(\succeq, X), & \text{if } \succeq = \succeq' \\ \varphi^{\pi_2}(\succeq, X), & \text{if } \succeq \neq \succeq', \end{cases}$$

then φ satisfies EFF (and NW), EF1, and RM, but it does not satisfy WRP.

Resource monotonic (RM). Suppose $\mathbb{O} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$. Consider the set $X' = \{x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}\}$ and a preference profile $\succeq' \in \mathcal{R}^N$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}\succeq'_1|_{X'} &= x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+1}; \\ \succeq'_i|_{X'} &= x_2, \dots, x_{n+1}, x_1, \text{ for all } i \in N \setminus \{1\}.\end{aligned}$$

Consider a picking sequence $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow N$ satisfying $(f(k))_{k=1}^{n+1} = (1, 1, 2, \dots, n)$. Then

$$\varphi_1^f(\succeq', X') = \{x_1, x_2\} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_i^f(\succeq', X') = \{x_{i+1}\} \text{ for all } i \in N \setminus \{1\}.$$

Let φ be the allocation rule given by

$$\varphi(\succeq, X) = \begin{cases} \varphi^f(\succeq', X') & \text{if } \succeq = \succeq' \text{ and } X = X'; \\ \varphi^\pi(\succeq, X) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where φ^π is the draft rule associated with the identity priority π . It is clear that φ satisfies EFF (and NW) and RP- π (and WRP- π). To show that φ satisfies EF1, by Proposition 2 it is enough to consider the allocation at $\varphi^f(\succeq', X')$. Since $x_{i+1} \succeq'_i x_1$ for each $i \in N \setminus \{1\}$, we have that EF1 holds. But φ fails RM, since

$$\varphi_2(\succeq', X' \setminus \{x_{n+1}\}) = \varphi_2^\pi(\succeq', X' \setminus \{x_{n+1}\}) = \{x_2\} \succ_2^{PD} \{x_3\} = \varphi_2^f(\succeq', X') = \varphi_2(\succeq', X').$$

2.4.2 Impossibility Results and Incentive Properties of the Draft

The most concerning deficiency of draft rules is that they are not strategy-proof. Intuitively, an agent may want to rank an object that is popular with other agents higher in her reported preference order at the expense of an unpopular object that she likes more. The following example illustrates this for the simple case with $n = 2$ agents; the example can be extended to larger problems as well but the general case with $n \geq 2$ agents is also implied by Theorem 2 below.

Example 2. Suppose there are $n = 2$ agents. Without loss of generality, let π be the identity priority and consider the allocation rule φ^π . Consider the set $X = \{a, b, c\}$ of available objects and a preference profile $\succeq \in \mathcal{R}^N$ satisfying $\succeq_1|_X = a, b, c$ and $\succeq_2|_X = b, c, a$. Suppose agent 1 misrepresents her preferences by reporting $\succeq'_1 \in \mathcal{R}$, where $\succeq'_1|_X = b, a, c$. Then

$$\{a, b\} = \varphi_1^\pi((\succeq'_1, \succeq_{-1}), X) \succ_1^{PD} \varphi_1^\pi(\succeq, X) = \{a, c\},$$

which violates WSP. ◇

One may ask whether there are weakly strategy-proof allocation rules that satisfy the competitive balance properties, RP- π and EF1, thereby making them appealing to sports leagues. The following theorem shows that any such rule is wasteful, hence inefficient. Thus, every efficient allocation rule satisfying the competitive balance properties is manipulable.

Theorem 2. *No allocation rule φ satisfies RP, EF1, NW, and WSP.*

One can omit RP in Theorem 2 if NW is replaced with EFF, which is more demanding.

Theorem 3. *No allocation rule φ satisfies EFF, EF1, and WSP.*

We emphasize that Theorems 2 and 3 hold for any number of agents $n \geq 2$. Our following result says that, when there are only $n = 2$ agents, the tension between EF1 and incentive compatibility becomes even more severe: in this case, every allocation rule satisfying EF1 and SP is wasteful.

Theorem 4. *Suppose there are $n = 2$ agents. Then no allocation rule φ satisfies NW, EF1, and SP.*

Theorems 3 and 4 are sharp in the sense that none of the properties are superfluous for the impossibility results. The null rule violates NW (and, hence, EFF), but it satisfies EF1, SP, and RP- π for any priority π . The π -dictatorship rule (where agent $\pi^{-1}(1)$ is the dictator) violates EF1, but it satisfies RP- π and SP. The draft rule associated with π violates WSP by Theorem 2, but it satisfies RP- π , EF1, and EFF by Proposition 2. These facts are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Properties of selected allocation rules

	RP- π	EF1	EFF	NW	SP	WSP
Null rule	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
π -Dictatorship	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Draft rule φ^π	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No

Table 1 also demonstrates that EF1, NW, and WSP are indispensable in the statement of Theorem 2. Whether there exists an allocation rule satisfying NW, EF1, and WSP is unclear. In fact, we conjecture that NW, EF1 and WSP are incompatible for any number of agents. Such a result would subsume Theorems 2, 3 and 4.

These impossibility results highlight the strong conflict between the competitive balance properties and agents' incentives. Nevertheless, the following result shows that draft rules satisfy a weak but compelling notion of incentive compatibility: truthful reporting is a maximizer in a draft rule whenever agents have additive preferences.

Theorem 5. *Every draft rule φ^π is maxmin strategy-proof.*

Theorem 5 shows that truth-telling is optimal when agents are maxmin expected utility maximizers—this is the case if, say, agents are uncertainty averse and they face sufficient uncertainty about the other agents’ preferences (Gilboa and Schmeidler, 1989).

Troyan and Morrill (2020) propose a typology of rules that are not strategyproof, dividing them into those that are obviously manipulable and those that are not. This categorization is done by comparing the worst- and best-case outcomes of a profitable manipulation to the worst- and best-case outcomes of a truthful report, respectively. More concretely, a draft rule φ^π is *not obviously manipulable* if for any profitable deviation \succeq'_i , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\succeq'_{-i} \in \mathcal{R}^{N \setminus i}} u_i \left(\varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq_i, \succeq'_{-i} \right), X \right) \right) &\leq \min_{\succeq'_{-i} \in \mathcal{R}^{N \setminus i}} u_i \left(\varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq_i, \succeq'_{-i} \right), X \right) \right); \text{ and} \\ \max_{\succeq'_{-i} \in \mathcal{R}^{N \setminus i}} u_i \left(\varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq_i, \succeq'_{-i} \right), X \right) \right) &\leq \max_{\succeq'_{-i} \in \mathcal{R}^{N \setminus i}} u_i \left(\varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq_i, \succeq'_{-i} \right), X \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

for any additive utility function u_i consistent with \succeq_i . It is clear that the first of these inequalities is implied by Theorem 5. The second one is easy to verify directly. The best-case scenario after i reports truthfully is for her to receive her k most-preferred objects, where $k := |\varphi_i^\pi(\cdot, X)|$. This occurs when, for example, all other agents rank those k objects at the bottom of their preference orders. As that is the best possible outcome for i , the second inequality follows.²⁰

Corollary 1. *Every draft rule φ^π is not obviously manipulable.*

Taken together, Theorem 5 and Corollary 1 imply that, even though draft rules are not strategyproof, they nevertheless possess desirable incentive properties. When others’ reported preferences are unknown, ambiguity averse agents may “insure” themselves by reporting truthfully. Additionally, profitable deviations are not obvious and finding them is cognitively demanding. See also Aziz et al. (2017), who show that even determining whether there exists a profitable deviation in the case of additive utility is NP-complete, even when others’ preference reports are known.

3 Extensions

In most sports drafts, the picking of players stops long before the set of available recruits has been fully exhausted, and many recruits are left unassigned. The draft rules defined in Section 2.3 do not permit such outcomes. This section considers two distinct environments in

²⁰We are grateful to Shiri Ron for pointing out the connection between maxmin strategy-proofness and non-obvious manipulability.

which these outcomes are natural. For each environment, we introduce generalized versions of the draft rules of Section 2.3, and we provide a characterization result that parallels Theorem 1.

3.1 Quotas

Many sports drafts consist of a fixed number of rounds, with each team receiving one pick per round. For example, the NBA draft grants each team with exactly two picks, whereas the NFL draft allows each team seven picks. These situations can be modeled as environments in which all teams face the same quota, which must be filled exactly. In other sports drafts, such as the Australian Football League (AFL) draft, the number of possible picks is constrained by caps on squad sizes. Unpredictable factors such as retirement and injury mean that teams typically enter the draft with different roster sizes and, hence, different recruiting needs. One can interpret such situations as environments with heterogeneous effective quotas.

It is relatively straightforward to incorporate (potentially heterogeneous) quotas into our model. Our main characterization result extends naturally to this setting, after appropriately modifying the definitions of allocation rules, draft rules, and the agents' partial orders from pairwise comparison.

To this end, assume that each agent $i \in N$ faces some positive quota $q_i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. One can interpret each q_i as the maximum number of goods demanded by agent i . Let $q = (q_i)_{i \in N}$ denote a profile of quotas. Given bundles $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$ and a preference relation \succeq_i , we say that $A \succeq_i^{PD} B$ if there is an injection $\mu : \text{top}_{\succeq_i}(B, \min\{q_i, |B|\}) \rightarrow \text{top}_{\succeq_i}(A, \min\{q_i, |A|\})$ such that

$$\mu(x) \succeq_i x \text{ for all } x \in \text{top}_{\succeq_i}(B, \min\{q_i, |B|\}).$$

That is, when evaluating any bundle whose size exceeds q_i , agent i considers only the best q_i objects in that bundle. Note that \succeq_i^{PD} reduces to the standard definition if $q_i = \infty$.

The allocation rules of this section are analogous to the rules defined in Section 2.1 except that they satisfy the following feasibility condition: no agent i is ever assigned a bundle whose size exceeds q_i . Formally, an allocation rule is a function $\varphi : \mathcal{R}^N \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ satisfying the following properties:

1. for each problem (\succeq, X) , $\varphi(\succeq, X) \in \mathcal{A}(X)$; and
2. for each problem (\succeq, X) and each agent $i \in N$, $|\varphi_i(\succeq, X)| \leq q_i$.

We maintain the definitions of EF1, and RM (see Properties 3, 4, and 8) but, on a formal level, these properties are distinct from their counterparts in the standard model as they reference the modified pairwise dominance extension \succeq_i^{PD} . The definitions of WRP- π and NW

require slight modifications in the presence of quotas. An allocation rule that is weakly respectful of priority π assigns to each agent a bundle that either equals that agent's quota or it is at least as large as the bundle of any agent with lower priority. A non-wasteful allocation rule assigns all objects whenever it is feasible to do so; otherwise, it fills the agents' quotas exactly.

Property 3[#]. An allocation rule φ is *weakly respectful of the priority π given q (WRP^q - π)* if, for any problem (\succeq, X) and any agent $i \in N$, either

$$|\varphi_i(\succeq, X)| = q_i, \text{ or } |\varphi_i(\succeq, X)| \geq |\varphi_j(\succeq, X)| \text{ for each } j \in N \text{ such that } \pi(i) < \pi(j).$$

Property 6[#]. An allocation rule φ is *non-wasteful given q (NW^q)* if, for any problem (\succeq, X) , $|\varphi(\succeq, X)| = \min\{|X|, \sum_{i \in N} q_i\}$.

The *draft rule associated with (π, q)* , denoted $\varphi^{\pi, q}$, is defined much like in Section 2.3, except that it assigns a null object, ω ($\omega \notin \mathbb{O}$), to the relevant agent whenever that agent's quota has already been filled. Formally, to each problem (\succeq, X) , $\varphi^{\pi, q}$ associates the allocation $\varphi^{\pi, q}(\succeq, X) \in \mathcal{A}(X)$ determined by the following procedure.

Algorithm 2: DRAFT(\succeq, X, π, q).

Input: A problem (\succeq, X) , a priority π , and a profile of quotas q .

Output: An allocation $\varphi^{\pi, q}(\succeq, X) \in \mathcal{A}(X)$ such that $|\varphi_i^{\pi, q}(\succeq, X)| \leq q_i$ for each agent $i \in N$.

1. Define the sequence $(s_k)_{k=1}^K$ of *selections* recursively. Set:

(a) $s_1 = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f^{\pi(1)}}} (X)$.

(b) for $k = 2, \dots, K$,

$$s_k = \begin{cases} \text{top}_{\succeq_{f^{\pi(k)}}} (X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\}), & \text{if } |\{\ell \in \{1, \dots, k-1\} \mid f^{\pi}(\ell) = f^{\pi}(k)\}| < q_i; \\ \omega, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where K is the smallest integer such that $s_{K-(n-1)} = s_{K-(n-2)} = \dots = s_{K-1} = s_K = \omega$.²¹

²¹That is, the procedure terminates after the earliest step at which all agents have been assigned the null object at least once. Note that the number of objects remaining decreases by at least one in any sequence of n steps, unless an agent is assigned the null object at each step in the sequence. Therefore, the procedure always terminates after at most $n|X| < \infty$ steps.

2. For each $i \in N$, set $\varphi_i^{\pi,q}(\succeq, X) = \{s_k \mid f^\pi(k) = i, 1 \leq k \leq K\} \setminus \{\omega\}$.
3. Return $\varphi^{\pi,q}(\succeq, X) = (\varphi_i^{\pi,q}(\succeq, X))_{i \in N}$.

Unlike Algorithm 1, which takes any picking sequence f as an input, Algorithm 2 takes a priority π as an input. Indeed, in all remaining sections we focus our attention on draft rules associated with some priority, rather than draft rules associated with general picking sequences.

The draft rule $\varphi^{\pi,q}$ is the unique allocation rule satisfying WRP^q - π , $EF1$, NW^q , and RM .

Theorem 6. *An allocation rule φ satisfies WRP^q - π , $EF1$, NW^q , and RM , if and only if it is the draft rule associated with (π, q) .*

The proof is a straightforward adaptation of the proof of Theorem 1 and it is omitted.

3.2 Unacceptable objects

In most sports drafts, upon picking a player, a team receives that player's contract rights. It can choose whether to sign him or her, trade the contract rights to another team, or simply retain the contract rights without offering a contract. In other words, contract rights are subject to free disposal. A pick's positive option value means that a team would never want to pass on their turn in the draft even if the remaining pool of players is below replacement level.

The implementation of the draft in the AFL is different: whenever a team chooses a player in one of the AFL drafts, it must sign that player to its squad subject to the applicable minimum wages. This violates free disposal and, as a result, teams frequently pass in later rounds of the AFL drafts (even before filling their quotas) as they find all remaining available players to be unacceptable.²²

In this section, we extend the preference domain by allowing agents to declare some objects unacceptable. The sets N of agents, \mathbb{O} of potential objects, \mathcal{X} of sets of available objects and \mathcal{B} of bundles are the same as in Section 2.1. Now a (*strict*) preference \succeq_i for agent i is a complete, transitive, and antisymmetric binary relation on $\mathbb{O} \cup \{\omega\}$, where ω is a “null object” which represents receiving no real object. We write \succ_i for the asymmetric part of \succeq_i , i.e., for all $x, y \in \mathbb{O} \cup \{\omega\}$, $x \succ_i y$ if and only if $x \succeq_i y$ and $x \neq y$. Let \mathcal{R} denote the set of all strict preferences. The set of all preference profiles $\succeq = (\succeq_i)_{i \in N}$ is denoted by \mathcal{R}^N .

Given $\succeq_i \in \mathcal{R}$ and $x \in \mathbb{O} \cup \{\omega\}$, $U(\succeq_i, x) = \{y \in \mathbb{O} \mid y \succeq_i x\}$ denotes the *upper contour set* of x at \succeq_i . We say an object $x \in \mathbb{O}$ is *acceptable* at \succeq_i if $x \succ_i \omega$; x is *unacceptable* at \succeq_i if $\omega \succ_i x$. We denote the set of acceptable objects at \succeq_i by $U(\succeq_i) := U(\succeq_i, \omega)$. As above, given

²²For example, the Greater Western Sydney Giants passed in the last seven rounds of the nine-round 2016 AFL rookie draft.

a set $X \in \mathcal{X}$, let $\text{top}_{\succeq_i}(X)$ denote the top-ranked object according to \succeq_i , which is now possibly ω .

The definition of the pairwise dominance extension must be adapted to the present setting. Given a preference relation $\succeq_i \in \mathcal{R}$, the *pairwise dominance extension* \succeq_i^{PD} is the binary relation on \mathcal{B} defined as follows: for all $S, T \in \mathcal{B}$, $S \succeq_i^{PD} T$ if and only if there is an injection $\mu : T \cap U(\succeq_i) \rightarrow S \cap U(\succeq_i)$ such that $\mu(x) \succeq_i x$ for each $x \in T \cap U(\succeq_i)$. Note that the relation \succeq_i^{PD} ignores the ranking of unacceptable objects.²³ This does not affect our results because, in what follows, we will restrict attention to individually rational allocation rules.

3.3 Properties of Allocation Rules

We define several efficiency properties and provide a useful relationship between them. The first property is specific to the present setting, in which objects may be deemed unacceptable. Given a problem (\succeq, X) , an allocation $A \in \mathcal{A}(X)$ is called *individually rational at* (\succeq, X) if, for each agent $i \in N$, it holds that $A_i \subseteq U(\succeq_i)$.

Property 12. An allocation rule φ is *individually rational (IR)* if, for any problem (\succeq, X) , $\varphi(\succeq, X)$ is individually rational at (\succeq, X) .

The remaining properties are adapted from the properties defined in Section 2.2. An allocation rule weakly respects priority π if the assigned bundle of each agent contains more objects that she finds acceptable than the bundle of any agent with lower priority according to π .

Property 3*. An allocation rule φ is *weakly respectful of the priority π (WRP* $-\pi$)* if, for any problem (\succeq, X) and any agent $i \in N$,

$$|\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \cap U(\succeq_i)| \geq |\varphi_j(\succeq, X) \cap U(\succeq_i)| \text{ for each } j \in N \text{ such that } \pi(i) < \pi(j).$$

An allocation rule φ is *weakly respectful of a priority (WRP*)* if there exists a priority π such that φ satisfies WRP* $-\pi$.

An allocation $A = (A_i)_{i \in N}$ is *efficient at* (\succeq, X) if (i) A is individually rational at (\succeq, X) , and (ii) there is no allocation $B \in \mathcal{A}(X)$ such that $B \neq A$ and $B_i \succeq_i^{PD} A_i$ for each $i \in N$.

Property 5*. An allocation rule φ is *efficient (EFF*)* if, for any problem (\succeq, X) , $\varphi(\succeq, X)$ is efficient at (\succeq, X) .

²³For example, if $a \succ_i \omega \succ_i b$, then $\{a, b\} \succeq_i^{PD} \{a\}$ even though $\{a, b\}$ contains an unacceptable object. Of course, we also have $\{a\} \succeq_i^{PD} \{a, b\}$, which implies that \succeq_i^{PD} is *not* antisymmetric (unlike in Section 2.1).

Note that individual rationality is a prerequisite for efficiency in this setting. The reason is that efficiency should preclude the possibility of improving upon the welfare of all agents by *any* means, including by deleting objects from an agent's bundle. In the context of sports leagues, the removal of an unacceptable player can be beneficial for the team, since no team would want to sign a player whose expected marginal product is less than the league's minimum wage.

Given a preference profile \succeq , let $U(\succeq) = \bigcup_{i \in N} U(\succeq_i)$ denote the set of objects which are acceptable to some agent. An allocation rule is non-wasteful if it always allocates available objects which are acceptable to some agent.

Property 6*. An allocation rule φ is *non-wasteful* (NW^*) if, for any problem (\succeq, X) , $U(\succeq) \cap X \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in N} \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$.

The remaining properties considered here are identical to those stated in Section 2.2. In particular, EF, RP- π , EF1, RT, and RM are defined exactly as in Properties 1, 2, 4, 7, and 8, respectively. The following result is the direct analogue of Proposition 1 in the current setting.

Proposition 3. *An allocation rule φ satisfies EFF^* if and only if it satisfies IR, NW^* , and RT.*

An additional invariance property is needed for our characterization of draft rules. Given a preference relation \succeq_i , we say \succeq'_i is a *truncation* of \succeq_i if there exists $x \in U(\succeq_i)$ such that $U(\succeq'_i) = U(\succeq_i, x)$ and $\succeq'_i|_{U(\succeq'_i)} = \succeq_i|_{U(\succeq'_i)}$. Moreover, if \succeq'_i is a *truncation* of \succeq_i then we say that \succeq_i is an *extension* of \succeq'_i .²⁴ We call \succeq_i the *complete extension* of \succeq'_i if $U(\succeq_i) = \emptyset$ and $\succeq'_i|_{\emptyset} = \succeq_i|_{\emptyset}$.²⁵ A preference profile $\succeq = (\succeq_i)_{i \in N}$ is called the *complete extension* of $\succeq' = (\succeq'_i)_{i \in N}$ if \succeq_i is the complete extension of \succeq'_i for each $i \in N$. The following properties require that no agent can profitably manipulate the outcome by reporting truncations or extensions.

Property 13. An allocation rule φ is

- (A) *truncation-proof* (TP) if, for any problem (\succeq, X) and agent $i \in N$, $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_i((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X)$ whenever \succeq'_i is a truncation of \succeq_i .
- (B) *extension-proof* (EP) if, for any problem (\succeq, X) and agent $i \in N$, $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_i((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X)$ whenever \succeq'_i is an extension of \succeq_i .

It is clear that SP implies both TP and EP. If an agent is assigned some bundle at a given problem, then *truncation invariance* requires that she is assigned the same bundle whenever she truncates to some preference relation under which the original bundle is acceptable.

²⁴For example, if $\emptyset = \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ and \succeq_i and \succeq'_i satisfy $\succeq_i = x_1, x_2, \omega, \dots$ and $\succeq'_i = x_1, x_2, x_3, \omega, \dots$, then \succeq_i is a truncation of \succeq'_i and \succeq'_i is an extension of \succeq_i .

²⁵Note that the complete extension of a preference relation is unique.

Property 14. An allocation rule φ is *truncation invariant (TI)* if, for any problem (\succeq, X) and agent $i \in N$, $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) = \varphi_i((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X)$ whenever \succeq'_i is a truncation of \succeq_i such that $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \subseteq U(\succeq'_i)$.

The following proposition, which says that TI is implied by the conjunction of IR, TP, and EP, highlights why TI is appealing.

Proposition 4. *If φ is an allocation rule satisfying IR, TP, and EP, then φ satisfies TI.*

3.4 Draft Rules

The draft rules defined in this section are virtually identical to those of Section 2.3, except that they never allocate any agent an unacceptable object. At each step of the draft procedure, the relevant agent is assigned her most-preferred remaining object, provided it is acceptable; if none of the remaining objects are acceptable, then she is assigned the null object. Formally, given a priority π , let $f^\pi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow N$ denote the *picking sequence associated with π* , defined by

$$(f^\pi(k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = \left(\underbrace{\pi^{-1}(1), \pi^{-1}(2), \dots, \pi^{-1}(n)}_{\text{round 1}}, \underbrace{\pi^{-1}(1), \pi^{-2}(2), \dots, \pi^{-1}(n)}_{\text{round 2}}, \dots \right).$$

The *draft rule associated with π* is the allocation rule $\varphi^\pi : \mathcal{R}^N \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ which associates to each problem (\succeq, X) the allocation $\varphi^\pi(\succeq, X) \in \mathcal{A}(X)$ determined by the following procedure.

Algorithm 3: U-DRAFT(\succeq, X, π).

Input: A problem (\succeq, X) and a priority π .

Output: An allocation $\varphi^\pi(\succeq, X) \in \mathcal{A}(X)$.

1. Define the sequence $(s_k)_{k=1}^K$ of *selections* recursively. Set:
 - (a) $s_1 = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f^\pi(1)}}(X)$.
 - (b) for $k = 2, \dots, K$, $s_k = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f^\pi(k)}}(X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\})$, where K is the smallest integer such that $s_{K-(n-1)} = s_{K-(n-2)} = \dots = s_{K-1} = s_K = \omega$.
2. For each $i \in N$, set $\varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X) = \{s_k \mid f^\pi(k) = i, 1 \leq k \leq K\} \setminus \{\omega\}$.
3. Return $\varphi^\pi(\succeq, X) = (\varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X))_{i \in N}$.

Draft rules satisfy a number of appealing properties, even in the presence of unacceptable objects.

Proposition 5. *For any priority π , the draft rule associated with π satisfies $RP\text{-}\pi$, $EF1$, EFF^* , RM , TP and EP .*

It follows from Propositions 3 and 4 that the draft rule φ^π satisfies $WRP^*\text{-}\pi$, $EF1$, NW^* , RM , IR , and TI . Our final result shows that these properties fully characterize the draft rule φ^π .

Theorem 7. *An allocation rule φ satisfies $WRP^*\text{-}\pi$, $EF1$, NW^* , RM , IR , and TI if and only if it is the draft rule associated with π .*

The independence of the properties in Theorem 7 is discussed below.

Individually rational (IR). Given any priority π , let φ denote the allocation rule defined by $\varphi(\succeq, X) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq', X)$, where \succeq' is the complete extension of \succeq . Clearly, φ satisfies NW^* , $RP\text{-}\pi$, $EF1$, RM , and TI , but it fails IR .

Non-wasteful (NW*). Let φ denote the null allocation rule, defined by $\varphi(\succeq, X) = (\emptyset)_{i \in N}$ for each problem (\succeq, X) . Then φ satisfies IR , $RP\text{-}\pi$, $EF1$, RM , and TI , but it fails NW^* .

Weakly respectful of a priority (WRP*). Let π_1 denote the identity priority and suppose π_2 is the priority that reverses the order of the agents relative to π_1 , i.e., $\pi_2(i) = n + 1 - i$ for all $i \in N$. Letting $x \in \mathbb{O}$, let \mathcal{R}_x be the class of preference relations such that $\succeq_i \in \mathcal{R}_x$ if and only if $x \succeq y$ for all $y \in \mathbb{O}$. Let φ be the allocation rule defined by

$$\varphi(\succeq, X) = \begin{cases} \varphi^{\pi_1}(\succeq, X), & \text{if } \succeq_1 \in \mathcal{R}_x \\ \varphi^{\pi_2}(\succeq, X), & \text{if } \succeq_1 \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_x. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that φ violates WRP^* , but it satisfies EFF^* (and, hence, IR and NW^*), $EF1$, and RM . It remains to show that φ satisfies TI .

Observe that if $\succeq_1 \in \mathcal{R}_x$, then (i) each truncation \succeq'_1 of \succeq_1 belongs to \mathcal{R}_x , and (ii) each extension \succeq''_1 of \succeq_1 belongs to \mathcal{R}_x . Similarly, if $\succeq_1 \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_x$, then (i) each truncation \succeq'_1 of \succeq_1 belongs to $\mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_x$, and (ii) each extension \succeq''_1 of \succeq_1 belongs to $\mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_x$. Therefore, φ satisfies TI .

Envy-free up to one object (EF1). Given any priority π , let φ denote the *serial dictatorship*, defined for any problem (\succeq, X) by

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_{\pi^{-1}(1)}(\succeq, X) &= X \cap U(\succeq_{\pi^{-1}(1)}) \\ \varphi_{\pi^{-1}(2)}(\succeq, X) &= X \cap U(\succeq_{\pi^{-1}(2)}) \setminus \varphi_{\pi^{-1}(1)}(\succeq, X) \\ &\vdots \\ \varphi_{\pi^{-1}(k)}(\succeq, X) &= X \cap U(\succeq_{\pi^{-1}(k)}) \setminus \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \varphi_{\pi^{-1}(\ell)}(\succeq, X).\end{aligned}$$

Then φ satisfies IR, NW^* , RP- π , RM, and TI, but it violates EF1.

Resource monotonic (RM). Consider the set $X' = \{x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}\}$ and a preference profile \succeq' such that

$$\begin{aligned}\succeq'_1|_{X'} &= x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+1}, \\ \succeq'_i|_{X'} &= x_2, x_3, \dots, x_{n+1}, x_1 \text{ for all } i \in N \setminus \{1\},\end{aligned}$$

and $U(\succeq'_i) = X'$ for all $i \in N$. Let $\overline{\mathcal{R}^N}$ be the class of all preference profiles \succeq such that, for each $i \in N$, \succeq_i is either a truncation or an extension of \succeq'_i . Consider the allocation rule φ defined by

$$\varphi(\succeq, X) = (\{x_1\} \cup \varphi_1^\pi(\succeq, X' \setminus \{x_1\}), \varphi_2^\pi(\succeq, X' \setminus \{x_1\}), \dots, \varphi_n^\pi(\succeq, X' \setminus \{x_1\}))$$

whenever $X = X'$, $\succeq \in \overline{\mathcal{R}^N}$ and $x_1 \succ_1 \omega$, and by $\varphi(\succeq, X) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, X)$ otherwise.²⁶ Then φ violates RM, since

$$\varphi_2(\succeq', X' \setminus \{x_{n+1}\}) = \{x_2\} \succ_2'^{PD} \{x_3\} = \varphi_2(\succeq', X').$$

It is straightforward to show that φ satisfies NW^* , IR, RP- π , EF1 and TI.

Truncation invariant (TI). Without loss of generality, assume π is the identity priority. Let \succeq' be a preference profile satisfying the following properties:

1. $b \succ'_1 x \succ'_1 a \succ'_1 \omega$ for all $x \in \mathbb{O} \setminus \{a, b\}$.
2. $a \succ'_2 \omega \succ'_2 b$.

²⁶That is, if $X = X'$, $\succeq \in \overline{\mathcal{R}^N}$ and $x_1 \succ_1 \omega$, then φ returns the allocation which agrees with $\varphi^\pi(\succeq, X' \setminus \{x_1\})$, except that it augments agent 1's bundle with the object x_1 .

3. $U(\succeq'_i) = \emptyset$ for each $i \in N$.

Then define the allocation rule φ by

$$\varphi(\succeq, X) = \begin{cases} (X, \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset), & \text{if } \succeq = \succeq', X \subseteq \{a, b\} \\ \varphi^\pi(\succeq, X), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that φ satisfies IR, NW*, RP- π , and EF1. To see that φ satisfies RM, note that if $X \subseteq \{a, b\}$ and $X \subseteq X' \not\subseteq \{a, b\}$, then $\varphi_1(\succeq', X) = X$ and $\varphi_1(\succeq', X') \supseteq \{b, x\}$ for some $x \in \mathbb{O} \setminus \{a, b\}$ with $x \succ'_1 a$; consequently, $\varphi_1(\succeq', X') \succeq_1^{PD} \varphi_1(\succeq', X)$. Finally, φ fails TI, since if \succeq'_2 is a truncation of \succeq_2^* such that $a \succ_2^* b \succ_2^* \omega$, then $\varphi_2((\succeq_2^*, \succeq'_{-2}), \{a, b\}) = \{a\} \subseteq U(\succeq'_2)$ but

$$\varphi_2((\succeq_2^*, \succeq'_{-2}), \{a, b\}) = \{a\} \neq \emptyset = \varphi_2(\succeq', \{a, b\}).$$

4 Variable Populations

In this section, we enrich the domain of problems considered by allowing the set of agents to vary. Let $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ denote the set of *potential agents*. As in the previous sections, \mathbb{O} is a countably infinite set of *potential objects*. Denote $\mathcal{N} := \{N \subseteq \mathbb{N} \mid 0 < |N| < \infty\}$ and $\mathcal{X} = \{X \subseteq \mathbb{O} \mid |X| < \infty\}$. A *problem* is a triple (N, X, \succeq) , where $N \in \mathcal{N}$, $X \in \mathcal{X}$, and $\succeq = (\succeq_i)_{i \in N}$ is an N -*profile* of preference relations on X . The set of all preference relations on X is denoted by $\mathcal{R}(X)$.

Given $N \in \mathcal{N}$, an N -*allocation* is a profile $A = (A_i)_{i \in N}$ of disjoint bundles, one for each member of N . For each $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{A}(N, X)$ denotes the set of *feasible* allocations, i.e., the set of N -allocations $A = (A_i)_{i \in N}$ such that $\bigcup_{i \in N} A_i \subseteq X$. An *allocation rule* is a function φ which maps each problem (N, X, \succeq) to a feasible allocation $\varphi(N, X, \succeq) \in \mathcal{A}(N, X)$.

4.1 Properties of Allocation Rules

We first introduce three properties, *population consistency*, *top-object consistency*, and *neutrality*, which have not been considered in our previous sections. We adopt the following notation: given an N -allocation $A = (A_i)_{i \in N}$, and a nonempty subset $I \subseteq N$, A_I denotes the restriction of A to I , i.e., the I -allocation $A_I = (A_i)_{i \in I}$.

An allocation rule is *population consistent* if, for any problem (N, X, \succeq) , and any subgroup I of N , the rule selects the restriction $\varphi_I(N, X, \succeq)$ of $\varphi(N, X, \succeq)$ to I in the “reduced problem” faced by I .

Property 15. An allocation rule φ is

(A) *population consistent (CON)* if, for any problem (N, X, \succeq) and any nonempty subset $N' \subsetneq N$,

$$\varphi \left(N \setminus N', X \setminus X', \left(\succeq_i|_{X \setminus X'} \right)_{i \in N \setminus N'} \right) = \varphi_{N \setminus N'}(N, X, \succeq),$$

where $X' = \bigcup_{i \in N'} \varphi_i(N, X, \succeq)$ is the set of objects assigned to the members of N' at (N, X, \succeq) .

(B) *pairwise consistent (2-CON)* if, for any problem (N, X, \succeq) and any nonempty subset $N' \subsetneq N$ with $|N \setminus N'| = 2$,

$$\varphi \left(N \setminus N', X \setminus X', \left(\succeq_i|_{X \setminus X'} \right)_{i \in N \setminus N'} \right) = \varphi_{N \setminus N'}(N, X, \succeq),$$

where $X' = \bigcup_{i \in N'} \varphi_i(N, X, \succeq)$ is the set of objects assigned to the members of N' at (N, X, \succeq) .

Population consistency implies pairwise consistency, but the converse is false.

Property 16. An allocation rule φ is *top-object consistent (T-CON)* if, for any problem (N, X, \succeq) and any agent $i \in N$,

$$\varphi_i \left(N, X \setminus X', \succeq|_{X \setminus X'} \right) = \varphi_i(N, X, \succeq) \setminus X',$$

where $X' = \bigcup_{i \in N} \left\{ \text{top}_{\succeq_i}(\varphi_i(N, X, \succeq)) \right\}$ adopting the convention that $\{\text{top}_{\succeq_i}(O)\} = \emptyset$ if $O = \emptyset$.

Consistent rules are robust to sequential processing of the *agents*. That is, whenever an N -allocation is chosen and a group $N' \subseteq N$ of agents departs with their assigned bundles, the rule should not prescribe a different $N \setminus N'$ -allocation when facing the remaining agents and objects. Top-object consistency implies a similar kind of robustness against non-simultaneous processing of the *objects*. That is, whenever an N -allocation is chosen and the agents' favorite objects are distributed first, the rule should not change the assignments in the reduced problem comprising all of the agents and the remaining objects.

Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$, $X, X' \in \mathcal{X}$, and suppose $\sigma : X \rightarrow X'$ is a bijection. Given an allocation $A = (A_i)_{i \in N} \in \mathcal{A}(N, X)$, $\sigma(A)$ denotes the N -allocation in $\mathcal{A}(N, X')$ obtained by relabelling the objects according to σ , i.e., $\sigma(A) = (\sigma(A_i))_{i \in N}$. Given a preference relation $\succeq_i \in \mathcal{R}(X)$, \succeq_i^σ is the preference relation in $\mathcal{R}(X')$ obtained by relabelling the objects according to σ , i.e., for all $x, y \in X$, $x \succeq_i y \iff \sigma(x) \succeq_i^\sigma \sigma(y)$. Given an N -profile $\succeq \in \mathcal{R}(X)^N$, $\succeq^\sigma = (\succeq_i^\sigma)_{i \in N}$ denotes the corresponding N -profile in $\mathcal{R}(X')^N$.

Property 17. An allocation rule φ is

(A) *neutral (NEU)* if, for any problem (N, X, \succeq) , any set $X' \in \mathcal{X}$ and any bijection $\sigma : X \rightarrow X'$,

$$\sigma(\varphi(N, X, \succeq)) = \varphi(N, X', \succeq^\sigma).$$

(B) *pairwise neutral (2-NEU)* if, for any problem (N, X, \succeq) with $|N| = 2$, any set $X' \in \mathcal{X}$ and any bijection $\sigma : X \rightarrow X'$,

$$\sigma(\varphi(N, X, \succeq)) = \varphi(N, X', \succeq^\sigma).$$

Clearly, neutrality implies pairwise neutrality but the converse is false.

The remaining properties considered here, namely EF1, EFF, NW, and RM, are straightforward adaptations of their counterparts in the fixed population model of Section 2.2. In particular, EF1, EFF, and NW, are defined as in Properties 4, 5 and 6, respectively, upon replacing each instance of (\succeq, X) with (N, X, \succeq) .

Property 8[†]. An allocation rule φ is *resource monotonic (RM[†])* if, for any $N \in \mathcal{N}$, any $X, X' \in \mathcal{X}$, and any $\succeq \in \mathcal{R}(X)^N$,

$$X \supseteq X' \implies \varphi_i(N, X, \succeq) \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_i(N, X', \succeq|_{X'}) \text{ for all } i \in N.$$

4.2 Draft Rules

A *priority* is a linear order π on the set \mathbb{N} of potential agents.²⁷ Given potential agents $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $i\pi j$ means agent i has higher priority than j according to π .

Given a priority π and a set $N \in \mathcal{N}$ of agents, let f_N^π denote the picking sequence associated with π and N . That is, if $N = \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$ and $i_1\pi i_2\pi \dots \pi i_n$, then

$$(f_N^\pi(k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = \left(\underbrace{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n}_{\text{round 1}}, \underbrace{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n}_{\text{round 2}}, \dots \right).$$

With a priority π in hand, the *draft rule associated with* π , denoted φ^π , is defined in the natural way. Formally, to each problem (N, X, \succeq) , φ^π associates the allocation $\varphi^\pi(N, X, \succeq) \in \mathcal{A}(N, X)$ determined using the following algorithm.

²⁷In Section 2.2.1, while assuming the simpler case of a fixed population of agents and for the sake of notational simplicity, we defined π as a bijection from N to $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Note that using the bijection is equivalent to defining a linear order over the set of agents I : abusing notation, $i\pi j$ if and only if $\pi(i) < \pi(j)$.

Algorithm 4: $\text{DRAFT}(N, X, \succeq, \pi)$.

Input: A problem (N, X, \succeq) and a priority π .

Output: An allocation $\varphi^\pi(N, X, \succeq) \in \mathcal{A}(N, X)$.

1. Define the sequence $(s_k)_{k=1}^{|X|}$ of *selections* recursively. Set:
 - (a) $s_1 = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f_N^\pi(1)}}(X)$.
 - (b) for $k = 2, \dots, |X|$, $s_k = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f_N^\pi(k)}}(X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\})$.
2. For each $i \in N$, set $\varphi_i^\pi(N, X, \succeq) = \{s_k \mid f_N^\pi(k) = i, 1 \leq k \leq |X|\}$.
3. Return $\varphi^\pi(N, X, \succeq) = (\varphi_i^\pi(N, X, \succeq))_{i \in N}$.

An allocation rule φ is called a *draft rule* if there exists a priority π such that $\varphi = \varphi^\pi$. The following result says that draft rules satisfy each of the properties defined in this section. Its proof is straightforward and it is omitted.

Proposition 6. *For any priority π , the draft rule associated with π satisfies EFF, EF1, RM^\dagger , CON, T-CON, and NEU.*

Since CON implies 2-CON and NEU implies 2-NEU, every draft rule satisfies EFF, EF1, RM^\dagger , 2-CON, T-CON, and 2-NEU. We will show that draft rules are the only rules satisfying these properties. First, we establish two key lemmata.

The first lemma, the proof of which is heavily inspired by Theorem 1 of [Ergin \(2000\)](#), states that any allocation rule satisfying EF1, EFF, RM^\dagger , 2-CON, and 2-NEU agrees with a draft rule on the class of single-unit problems (i.e., problems (N, X, \succeq) such that $|X| \leq |N|$). Moreover, on this specific class of problems, a draft rule restricts to a serial dictatorship.

Lemma 3. *Suppose φ is an allocation rule satisfying EF1, EFF, RM^\dagger , 2-CON, and 2-NEU. Then there is a priority π such that $\varphi(N, X, \succeq) = \varphi^\pi(N, X, \succeq)$ whenever $|X| \leq |N|$.*

Given a “partial” allocation rule $\varphi|_{\mathcal{S}}$ that equals a serial dictatorship $\varphi^\pi|_{\mathcal{S}}$ on the class \mathcal{S} of single-unit problems, there are many ways to extend $\varphi|_{\mathcal{S}}$ to an allocation rule φ defined on the entire class of problems. The next lemma says that there is a unique extension φ satisfying RM and T-CON, and this extension equals φ^π .

Lemma 4. *Suppose φ is an allocation rule and π is a priority such that $\varphi(N, X, \succeq) = \varphi^\pi(N, X, \succeq)$ whenever $|X| \leq |N|$. If φ satisfies RM^\dagger and T-CON, then $\varphi = \varphi^\pi$.*

Lemmata 3 and 4, together with Proposition 6, immediately yield the following characterization of draft rules.

Theorem 8. *An allocation rule φ satisfies EF1, EFF, RM[†], 2-CON, T-CON, and 2-NEU if and only if there is a priority π such that $\varphi = \varphi^\pi$.*

The properties in Theorem 8 are independent, as illustrated below.

Envy-free up to one object (EF1). For any priority π , the π -dictatorship satisfies all properties except EF1.

Efficient (EFF). The null rule satisfies all properties except EFF.

Resource monotonic (RM[†]). Let π be any priority on \mathbb{N} . Define an allocation rule φ as follows.

1. For any problem (N, X, \succeq) with $|X| < |N|$, let $\varphi(N, X, \succeq) = \varphi^\pi(N, X, \succeq)$.
2. For any problem (N, X, \succeq) with $|X| = r|N|$, where $r \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\varphi(N, X, \succeq) = \varphi^\pi(N, X, \succeq)$.
3. For any problem (N, X, \succeq) with $|X| = r|N| + c$, where $r, c \in \mathbb{N}$, define $\varphi(N, X, \succeq)$ as follows. Let $g_N^X : \{1, \dots, |X|\} \rightarrow N$ denote the partial sequence defined by

$$\left(g_N^X(k)\right)_{k=1}^{|X|} = (i_{n+1-c}, \dots, i_n, i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n, \dots, i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n).$$

That is, the last $r|N|$ terms of the sequence consist of r repetitions of the usual ordering (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n) , while the first c terms consist of the *tail* (i_{n+1-c}, \dots, i_n) of the usual ordering on N . Then $\varphi(N, X, \succeq)$ is the outcome of the sequential allocation procedure which, at each step k , assigns agent $g_N^X(k)$ her top-ranked remaining object.

One can show that φ satisfies all of the properties except RM[†].

Pairwise consistency (2-CON). Let π be any priority on \mathbb{N} , and let $\bar{\pi}$ denote the inverse linear order (i.e., for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $i\pi j \iff j\bar{\pi}i$). Consider the allocation rule φ defined for each problem (N, X, \succeq) by

$$\varphi(N, X, \succeq) = \begin{cases} \varphi^\pi(N, X, \succeq), & \text{if } |N| = 2, \\ \varphi^{\bar{\pi}}(N, X, \succeq), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then φ violates 2-CON, but it satisfies the remaining properties.

Top-object consistent (T-CON). Given any priority π , let φ denote the *snake draft* associated with π . More precisely, for any problem (N, X, \succeq) with $N = \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$ and $i_1\pi \cdots \pi i_n$, let g_N^π denote the picking sequence

$$(g_N^\pi(k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = \left(\underbrace{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n}_{\text{round 1}}, \underbrace{i_n, i_{n-1}, \dots, i_1}_{\text{round 2}}, \underbrace{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n}_{\text{round 3}}, \underbrace{i_n, i_{n-1}, \dots, i_1, \dots}_{\text{round 4}}, \dots \right).$$

That is, g_N^π orders agents according to π in all “odd rounds”, and reverses the order in all “even rounds.” Let $\varphi(N, X, \succeq)$ be the outcome of the sequential allocation procedure which, at each step k , assigns agent $g_N^\pi(k)$ her top-ranked remaining object. It is easy to see that φ satisfies all properties except T-CON.

Pairwise neutrality (2-NEU). Let π be any priority, and let $x \in \mathbb{O}$. Define an allocation rule φ as follows.

1. For any problem (N, X, \succeq) such that (i) $x \in X$, (ii) for all $i \in N$ and $y \in X$, $y \succeq_i x$, let

$$\varphi(N, X, \succeq) = \left(\varphi_i^\pi(N, X \setminus \{x\}, \succeq|_{X \setminus \{x\}}) \cup \{x\}, \varphi_{-i}^\pi(N, X \setminus \{x\}, \succeq|_{X \setminus \{x\}}) \right),$$

where $i \in N$ is the lowest priority agent in N (i.e., for all $j \in N$, $j\pi i$).

2. For any problem other problem (N, X, \succeq) , $\varphi(N, X, \succeq) = \varphi^\pi(N, X, \succeq)$.

Clearly, φ violates 2-NEU. One can show that φ satisfies the remaining properties.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we present the first axiomatic characterization of the widely used draft mechanism, recast as a centralized allocation rule. The draft is the lone rule satisfying respect for priority, envy-freeness up to one object, non-wastefulness, and resource monotonicity. We argue that the first two properties are essential for competitive balance, an important desideratum in sports leagues where the draft is most prominently used. Despite lacking strategy-proofness, the draft retains some positive incentive properties: if agents are maxmin utility maximizers and face sufficient uncertainty about other agents’ preference reports, then truth-telling is optimal. Hence, the draft performs well in terms of efficiency, fairness, and incentive compatibility, three desiderata that are notoriously difficult to achieve simultaneously. Three impossibility results show that there does not exist a mechanism that can meaningfully improve on the draft’s properties. Overall, the draft appears very well suited for its primary goal of redressing competitive imbalances in sports leagues.

6 Appendix

Proof of Proposition 1: It is clear that EFF implies NW and RT. To see that NW and RT imply EFF, we prove the contrapositive: if φ violates EFF, then it violates NW, RT or both.

To this end, suppose φ is an allocation rule that violates EFF but satisfies NW. We will establish that φ violates RT. Since φ violates EFF, there is some problem (\succeq, X) and an allocation $A \in \mathcal{A}(X)$ such that $A_i \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$ for each $i \in N$ and $A_j \succ_j^{PD} \varphi_j(\succeq, X)$ for some $j \in N$. For each $i \in N$, let $\mu_i : \varphi_i(\succeq, X) \rightarrow A_i$ be an injection such that $\mu_i(x) \succeq_i x$ for each $x \in \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$. We may further assume that, for each $k = 1, \dots, |\varphi_i(\succeq, X)|$, μ_i maps the k th best object in $\varphi_i(\succeq, X)$ to the k th best object in A_i (according to \succeq_i).²⁸ Note also that, since $A_j \succ_j^{PD} \varphi_j(\succeq, X)$, there is some object $x \in \varphi_j(\succeq, X)$ such that $\mu_j(x) \succ_j x$.

Claim 1. $|A_i| = |\varphi_i(\succeq, X)|$ for each $i \in N$.

Proof. Since each μ_i is injective, we must have $|A_i| \geq |\varphi_i(\succeq, X)|$ for each agent $i \in N$. If $|A_i| > |\varphi_i(\succeq, X)|$ for some agent $i \in N$, then by NW and the fact that $A \in \mathcal{A}(X)$, we have

$$|X| = |\varphi(\succeq, X)| = \sum_{i \in N} |\varphi_i(\succeq, X)| < \sum_{i \in N} |A_i| = |A| \leq |X|,$$

which is a contradiction. □

Let $S := \bigcup_{i \in N} [A_i \setminus \varphi_i(\succeq, X)]$ be the set of objects allocated to different agents at $\varphi(\succeq, X)$ and A . We note that $S = \bigcup_{i \in N} [\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \setminus A_i]$, since $x \in A_i \setminus \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$ if and only if there is some agent i' for whom $x \in \varphi_{i'}(\succeq, X) \setminus A_{i'}$. It follows that $S \neq \emptyset$, for otherwise $A_i \subseteq \varphi_i(\succeq, X) \subseteq A_i$ for each $i \in N$, which contradicts the fact that $A \neq \varphi(\succeq, X)$.

Let $I := \{i \in N \mid A_i \neq \varphi_i(\succeq, X)\}$ denote the set of agents who receive different bundles at the allocations A and $\varphi(\succeq, X)$. Then $A_j \succ_j^{PD} \varphi_j(\succeq, X)$ implies $j \in I$, and consequently $I \neq \emptyset$.

We define a bipartite directed graph D with vertex set $I \cup S$. Each vertex has exactly one outgoing arc: let each agent $i \in I$ point to object $\text{top}_{\succeq_i}(S)$; let each object $x \in S$ point to the unique agent $i \in I$ for whom $x \in \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$.²⁹

Claim 2. For each agent $i \in I$, $\text{top}_{\succeq_i}(A_i \setminus \varphi_i(\succeq, X)) \succ_i \text{top}_{\succeq_i}(\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \setminus A_i)$.

Proof. Consider any agent $i \in I$. Since $A_i \neq \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$, by Claim 1 we must have $|A_i| = |\varphi_i(\succeq, X)| \geq 1$. Let $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) = \{x_1 \succ_i \dots \succ_i x_k\}$ and $A_i = \{y_1 \succ_i \dots \succ_i y_k\}$ for some $k \geq 1$. Then, the definition of μ_i implies that $\mu_i(x_\ell) = y_\ell$ for each $\ell = 1, \dots, k$.

²⁸If there exists an injection $\mu_i : \varphi_i(\succeq, X) \rightarrow A_i$ such that $\mu_i(x) \succeq_i x$ for each $x \in \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$, then there exists an injection with this additional property.

²⁹No object $x \in S$ can point to an agent $i \in N \setminus I$. To see why, observe that if $x \in \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$ for some $i \in N \setminus I$, then $A_i = \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$ and $x \notin S$!

Let ℓ^* be the smallest index such that $x_{\ell^*} \neq y_{\ell^*}$ (i.e., $x_{\ell^*} \neq y_{\ell^*}$ and $x_\ell = y_\ell$ whenever $1 \leq \ell < \ell^*$). Then $\mu_i(x_\ell) = y_\ell = x_\ell$ for $\ell < \ell^*$ and $y_{\ell^*} = \mu_i(x_{\ell^*}) \succ_i x_{\ell^*}$. Consequently, $x_{\ell^*-1} = y_{\ell^*-1} \succ_i y_{\ell^*} \succ_i x_{\ell^*}$, which means that $y_{\ell^*} \in A_i \setminus \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$.³⁰ By the choice of ℓ^* , we have $y_{\ell^*} = \text{top}_{\succeq_i}(A_i \setminus \varphi_i(\succeq, X))$.

Now consider any $z \in \varphi_i(\succeq, X) \setminus A_i$. Then $y_{\ell^*} \succ_i x_{\ell^*} \succeq_i z$, which implies that $y_{\ell^*} \succ_i \text{top}_{\succeq_i}(\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \setminus A_i)$. It follows that $\text{top}_{\succeq_i}(A_i \setminus \varphi_i(\succeq, X)) \succ_i \text{top}_{\succeq_i}(\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \setminus A_i)$, as claimed. \square

Since D is finite and each vertex has an outgoing arc, there exists a cycle with k distinct agents, say $C = (x_1, i_1, \dots, x_k, i_k, x_1)$.

Claim 3. The number, k , of agents in the cycle C is at least 2.

Proof. Suppose otherwise. Then $C = (x_1, i_1, x_1)$ and $x_1 \in \varphi_{i_1}(\succeq, X) \setminus A_{i_1}$, which implies that $x_1 = \text{top}_{\succeq_{i_1}}(S) = \text{top}_{\succeq_{i_1}}(\varphi_{i_1}(\succeq, X) \setminus A_{i_1})$. Since $A_{i_1} \setminus \varphi_{i_1}(\succeq, X) \subseteq S$, one has $\text{top}_{\succeq_{i_1}}(S) \succeq_{i_1} \text{top}_{\succeq_{i_1}}(A_{i_1} \setminus \varphi_{i_1}(\succeq, X))$. Consequently, $\text{top}_{\succeq_{i_1}}(\varphi_{i_1}(\succeq, X) \setminus A_{i_1}) \succeq_{i_1} \text{top}_{\succeq_{i_1}}(A_{i_1} \setminus \varphi_{i_1}(\succeq, X))$, which contradicts Claim 2. \square

By construction, the cycle C has the following properties:

1. For each $\ell = 1, \dots, k$, $x_\ell \in \varphi_{i_\ell}(\succeq, X) \setminus A_{i_\ell}$.

(Otherwise, $x_\ell \in \varphi_{i_\ell}(\succeq, X) \cap A_{i_\ell}$, which means that $x_\ell \notin S$, a contradiction.)

2. For each $\ell = 1, \dots, k$, $x_{\ell+1} \succ_{i_\ell} x_\ell$ (where x_{k+1} is interpreted as x_1).

(This relation holds because of the chain of relations

$$x_{\ell+1} = \text{top}_{\succeq_{i_\ell}}(S) \succeq_{i_\ell} \text{top}_{\succeq_{i_\ell}}(A_{i_\ell} \setminus \varphi_{i_\ell}(\succeq, X)) \succ_{i_\ell} \text{top}_{\succeq_{i_\ell}}(\varphi_{i_\ell}(\succeq, X) \setminus A_{i_\ell}) \succeq_{i_\ell} x_\ell,$$

where the strict preference holds by Claim 2 and the right-most relation holds because $x_\ell \in \varphi_{i_\ell}(\succeq, X) \setminus A_{i_\ell}$.)

3. For each $\ell = 1, \dots, k$, $i_\ell \neq i_{\ell+1}$ (where i_{k+1} is interpreted as i_1).

(This follows from Claim 3 and the fact that C is a cycle.)

Putting this all together, we have that $(i_1, x_1) \blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, \varphi(\succeq, X))} \cdots \blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, \varphi(\succeq, X))} (i_k, x_k) \blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, \varphi(\succeq, X))} (i_1, x_1)$ is a cycle of $\blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, \varphi(\succeq, X))}$. Thus, φ violates RT! \blacksquare

³⁰For the case $\ell^* = 1$, one has $y_1 \succ_i x_1$ and $y_1 \in A_i \setminus \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$.

Proof of Lemma 1: Consider any problem (\succeq, X) and, without loss of generality, assume π to be the identity priority. Since φ satisfies EF1, the sizes of any two agents' bundles differ by at most one object, i.e.,

$$\max_{i,j \in N} (|\varphi_i(\succeq, X)| - |\varphi_j(\succeq, X)|) \leq 1.$$

Moreover, by WRP- π , each agent's bundle size $|\varphi_j(\succeq, X)|$ is weakly monotonically decreasing in j . The desired conclusion follows directly from these two observations. ■

Proof of Lemma 2: Let $(s_k)_{k=1}^{|X|}$ be the sequence of selections associated with the draft procedure $\text{DRAFT}(\succeq, X, f)$. We show by induction that $s_k \in \varphi_{f(k)}(\succeq, X \cup \{x\})$ for each $k = 1, \dots, |X|$.

Base case ($k = 1$). Since $s_1 = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f(1)}}(X)$, RM implies that $s_1 \in \varphi_{f(1)}(\succeq, X \cup \{x\})$.

Inductive step. Suppose that, for some $k \in \{2, \dots, |X|\}$, $s_\ell \in \varphi_{f(\ell)}(\succeq, X \cup \{x\})$ whenever $1 \leq \ell < k$. We must show that $s_k \in \varphi_{f(k)}(\succeq, X \cup \{x\})$.

Observe that the induction hypothesis implies that $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \cap \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\} = \varphi_i(\succeq, X \cup \{x\}) \cap \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\}$ for each $i \in N$. Since $s_k \in \varphi_{f(k)}(\succeq, X)$ and $s_k = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f(k)}}(X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\})$, RM implies that $s_k \in \varphi_{f(k)}(\succeq, X \cup \{x\})$, as desired.

It follows that $s_k \in \varphi_{f(k)}(\succeq, X \cup \{x\})$ for each $k = 1, \dots, |X|$. Hence, $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \subseteq \varphi_i(\succeq, X \cup \{x\})$ for each $i \in N$. ■

Proof of Proposition 2: Without loss of generality, assume that π is the identity priority.

(EFF) By Proposition 1, it suffices to show that φ^π satisfies NW and RT. It is clear that NW holds. To verify RT, consider any problem (\succeq, X) and denote the binary relation $\blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, \varphi(\succeq, X))}$ by \blacktriangleright . Suppose, per contra, that $(i_1, x_1) \blacktriangleright \dots \blacktriangleright (i_k, x_k) \blacktriangleright (i_1, x_1)$ is a cycle of \blacktriangleright . Let $(s_k)_{k=1}^{|X|}$ be the sequence of selections associated with the draft procedure $\text{DRAFT}(\succeq, X, f^\pi)$. For each $\ell = 1, \dots, k$, let $t_\ell \in \{1, \dots, |X|\}$ be the step of the procedure in which object x_ℓ was assigned, i.e., $f^\pi(t_\ell) = i_\ell$ and $s_{t_\ell} = x_\ell$.

Since $x_2 \succ_{i_1} x_1$ and $x_1 \in \varphi_{i_1}^\pi(\succeq, X)$, object x_2 must have been allocated to agent i_2 at some step preceding the step at which x_1 was allocated to agent i_1 ; that is, $t_2 < t_1$. Since $x_3 \succ_{i_2} x_2$ and $x_2 \in \varphi_{i_2}^\pi(\succeq, X)$, object x_3 must have been allocated to agent i_3 at some step preceding t_2 ; that is, $t_3 < t_2$. Continuing in this fashion, we construct a sequence $(t_\ell)_{\ell=1}^k$ such that $t_k < t_{k-1} < \dots < t_2 < t_1$. But since $x_1 \succ_{i_k} x_k$ and $x_k \in \varphi_{i_k}^\pi(\succeq, X)$, object x_1 must have been allocated to agent i_1 at some step preceding t_k ; that is, $t_1 < t_k$, which is a contradiction. Hence, φ^π satisfies RT.

(RP- π) That φ^π satisfies RP- π is clear.

(EF1) To see that φ^π satisfies EF1, consider any problem (\succeq, X) and distinct agents $i, j \in N$ with $i < j$. It suffices to show that there exists $S \subseteq \varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X)$ such that $\varphi_j^\pi(\succeq, X) \succeq_j^{PD} \varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X) \setminus S$. If $\varphi_j^\pi(\succeq, X) = \emptyset$, then the definition of φ^π implies that $|\varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X)| \leq 1$; hence, $S =$

$\varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X)$ will do. So assume $\varphi_j^\pi(\succeq, X) \neq \emptyset$. Then we may write $\varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X) = \{x_1 \succ_i \cdots \succ_i x_k\}$ and $\varphi_j^\pi(\succeq, X) = \{y_1 \succ_j \cdots \succ_j y_\ell\}$ for some $\ell \geq 1$ and $k \in \{\ell, \ell + 1\}$ (because $i < j$). In the draft procedure $\text{DRAFT}(\succeq, X, f^\pi)$, for each $t = 2, \dots, k$, object y_{t-1} was assigned to agent j before object x_t was assigned to agent i ; hence, $y_{t-1} \succ_j x_t$ for each $t = 2, \dots, k$. Consequently, $\varphi_j(\succeq, X) \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_i(\succeq, X) \setminus \{x_1\}$ and EF1 holds.

(RM) By transitivity of \succeq_i^{PD} it suffices to show that, given a problem (\succeq, X) and an object $x \in \mathbb{O} \setminus X$, one has $\varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X \cup \{x\}) \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X)$ for each $i \in N$. Suppose $(s_k)_{k=1}^{|X|}$ is the sequence of selections associated with $\text{DRAFT}(\succeq, X, f^\pi)$, and $(s'_k)_{k=1}^{|X|+1}$ is the sequence of selections associated with $\text{DRAFT}(\succeq, X \cup \{x\}, f^\pi)$. We argue by induction that $X \cup \{x\} \setminus \{s'_1, \dots, s'_k\} \supseteq X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$ for each $k = 0, 1, \dots, |X| - 1$.

Base case ($k = 0$). Clearly, $X \cup \{x\} \setminus \emptyset \supseteq X \setminus \emptyset$.

Inductive step. Suppose $X \cup \{x\} \setminus \{s'_1, \dots, s'_{k-1}\} \supseteq X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\}$ for some $k \in \{1, \dots, |X| - 1\}$. We must show that $X \cup \{x\} \setminus \{s'_1, \dots, s'_k\} \supseteq X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$. Let $y \in X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$. The induction hypothesis implies that $X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \subseteq X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\} \subseteq X \cup \{x\} \setminus \{s'_1, \dots, s'_{k-1}\}$, which means that $y \in X \cup \{x\} \setminus \{s'_1, \dots, s'_{k-1}\}$. Let i be the agent who is assigned an object at step k of the draft procedure; that is, $i = f^\pi(k)$. Then

$$s'_k = \text{top}_{\succeq_i}(X \cup \{x\} \setminus \{s'_1, \dots, s'_{k-1}\}) \succeq_i \text{top}_{\succeq_i}(X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\}) = s_k \succ_i y,$$

which means that $s'_k \succ_i y$. Hence, $y \in X \cup \{x\} \setminus \{s'_1, \dots, s'_k\}$, as we needed to show.

Since $X \cup \{x\} \setminus \{s'_1, \dots, s'_k\} \supseteq X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$ for each $k = 0, 1, \dots, |X| - 1$, we have $s'_k \succeq_{f^\pi(k)} s_k$ for each $k = 1, \dots, |X|$. Therefore, RM holds. \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 1: The “if” direction is immediate from Proposition 2, so it suffices to prove the “only if” direction. Without loss of generality, we assume that π is the identity priority. Let $f^\pi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow N$ denote the picking sequence associated with π , defined by $(f^\pi(k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = (1, 2, \dots, n, 1, 2, \dots, n, \dots)$. Given any problem (\succeq, X) , we must show that $\varphi(\succeq, X) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, X)$.

Let $(s_k)_{k=1}^{|X|}$ denote the sequence of selections associated with the draft procedure $\text{DRAFT}(\succeq, X, f^\pi)$. For each $k = 1, \dots, |X|$, let $S_k := \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$. We argue by induction that $\varphi(\succeq, S_k) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, S_k)$ for each $k = 1, \dots, |X|$.

Base case ($k = 1$). Since φ satisfies NW and RP- π , agent 1 must receive object s_1 at the problem (\succeq, S_1) . Hence, $\varphi(\succeq, S_1) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, S_1)$.

Inductive step. Suppose that $\varphi(\succeq, S_{k-1}) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, S_{k-1})$ for some $k \in \{2, \dots, |X|\}$. We must show that $\varphi(\succeq, S_k) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, S_k)$.

Step 1: Objects in S_{k-1} are assigned to the “correct agents” at (\succeq, S_k) , i.e., $s_\ell \in \varphi_{f^\pi(\ell)}(\succeq, S_k)$ for each $\ell = 1, \dots, k-1$. Observe that $s_k \in \mathbb{O} \setminus S_{k-1}$ is an object which is worse for each agent than any object assigned to her at (\succeq, S_{k-1}) , i.e.,

$$\text{for each } j \in N, \quad (y \succ_j s_k \text{ for each } y \in \varphi_j(\succeq, S_{k-1})).$$

Therefore, Lemma 2 and the inductive hypothesis imply that $\varphi_j(\succeq, S_{k-1}) \subseteq \varphi_j(\succeq, S_k)$ for each agent $j \in N$. The inductive hypothesis implies $\varphi(\succeq, S_{k-1}) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, S_{k-1})$, and therefore $s_\ell \in \varphi_{f^\pi(\ell)}(\succeq, S_{k-1}) \subseteq \varphi_{f^\pi(\ell)}(\succeq, S_k)$ for each $\ell = 1, \dots, k-1$, as claimed.

Step 2: Object s_k is assigned to agent $f^\pi(k)$, i.e., $s_k \in \varphi_{f^\pi(k)}(\succeq, S_k)$. Since $\varphi(\succeq, S_{k-1}) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, S_{k-1})$, the definition of $\text{DRAFT}(\succeq, S_{k-1}, f^\pi)$ implies that $f^\pi(k-1)$ is an agent such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi_j(\succeq, S_{k-1})| &= |\varphi_{f^\pi(k-1)}(\succeq, S_{k-1})| \text{ whenever } j \leq f^\pi(k-1) \\ \text{and } |\varphi_j(\succeq, S_{k-1})| &= |\varphi_{f^\pi(k-1)}(\succeq, S_{k-1})| - 1 \text{ whenever } j > f^\pi(k-1). \end{aligned}$$

By Step 1 and NW, it holds that $\varphi_i(\succeq, S_k) = \varphi_i(\succeq, S_{k-1}) \cup \{s_k\}$ for exactly one agent $i \in N$, and $\varphi_j(\succeq, S_{k-1}) = \varphi_j(\succeq, S_k)$ for each agent $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$. We must show that $i = f^\pi(k)$.

Case 1. If $i > f^\pi(k)$, i.e., s_k is allocated to some agent with lower priority than $f^\pi(k)$, then the preceding discussion implies that

$$|\varphi_{f^\pi(k)}(\succeq, S_k)| = |\varphi_{f^\pi(k)}(\succeq, S_{k-1})| = |\varphi_i(\succeq, S_{k-1})| = |\varphi_i(\succeq, S_k)| - 1,$$

which contradicts RP- π .

Case 2. If $i < f^\pi(k)$, i.e., s_k is allocated to some agent with higher priority than $f^\pi(k)$, then the preceding discussion shows that

$$|\varphi_{f^\pi(k)}(\succeq, S_k)| = |\varphi_{f^\pi(k)}(\succeq, S_{k-1})| = |\varphi_i(\succeq, S_{k-1})| - 1 = |\varphi_i(\succeq, S_k)| - 2,$$

which, by Lemma 1, contradicts the fact that φ satisfies RP- π , and EF1.

Putting this all together, we have that $i = f^\pi(k)$ and $s_k \in \varphi_{f^\pi(k)}(\succeq, S_k)$.

By the principle of induction, we have $\varphi(\succeq, S_k) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, S_k)$ for each $k = 1, \dots, |X|$. In particular, $\varphi(\succeq, X) = \varphi(\succeq, S_{|X|}) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, S_{|X|}) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, X)$, as we needed to show. ■

Proof of Theorem 2: Without loss of generality, assume that π is the identity priority. Consider any set $X \in \mathcal{X}$ with $|X| = n+1$, say $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}\}$, and let \succeq be a preference profile

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \succeq_1|_X &= x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+1} \\ \text{and } \succeq_i|_X &= x_2, \dots, x_{n+1}, x_1, \text{ for all } i \in N \setminus \{1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Toward contradiction, assume that φ satisfies NW, RP- π , EF1 and WSP and consider the allocation $\varphi(\succeq, X)$. Lemma 1, NW, RP- π , and EF1 imply that agent 1 receives two objects while every agent $i \in N \setminus \{1\}$ receives one; moreover, RP- π implies that agent 1 receives her best object. Consequently,

$$\varphi_1(\succeq, X) \in \{\{x_1, x_2\}, \{x_1, x_3\}, \dots, \{x_1, x_{n+1}\}\}.$$

Suppose \succeq'_1 is a preference relation that agrees with \succeq_1 on X except that it interchanges the ranking of objects x_1 and x_2 , that is,

$$\succeq'_1|_X = x_2, x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{n+1}.$$

Consider the allocation $\varphi((\succeq'_1, \succeq_{-1}), X)$. Lemma 1, NW, RP- π , and EF1 imply that agent 1 receives two objects and each other agent receives one, while RP- π implies that 1 receives x_2 . Additionally, EF1 implies that $\varphi_1((\succeq'_1, \succeq_{-1}), X) = \{x_1, x_2\}$ as any other two-object bundle containing x_2 would violate EF1 for agent 1 and the agent receiving the bundle $\{x_1\}$. By WSP, $\{x_1, x_2\} = \varphi_1((\succeq'_1, \succeq_{-1}), X) \not\prec_1^{PD} \varphi_1(\succeq, X)$, which implies that

$$\varphi_1(\succeq, X) = \varphi_1((\succeq'_1, \succeq_{-1}), X) = \{x_1, x_2\}.$$

It follows from RP- π , NW, and EF1 that

$$\varphi_i(\succeq, X) = \varphi_i((\succeq'_1, \succeq_{-1}), X) = \{x_{i+1}\} \text{ for all } i \in N \setminus \{1\}.$$

Now suppose that \succeq'_n is a preference relation that agrees with \succeq_n on X except that it interchanges the ranking of objects x_1 and x_{n+1} , that is,

$$\succeq'_n|_X = x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n, x_1, x_{n+1}.$$

Consider the allocation $\varphi((\succeq'_n, \succeq_{-n}), X)$. As above, NW, RP- π , EF1, and Lemma 1 imply that agent 1 receives two objects, one of which is her best object x_1 , while each other agent receives one object. If $\varphi_1((\succeq'_n, \succeq_{-n}), X) = \{x_1, x_k\}$ for some $k \in \{2, \dots, n\}$, then EF1 implies that $\varphi_n((\succeq'_n, \succeq_{-n}), X) \neq \{x_{n+1}\}$. It follows that there is an agent $i \in N \setminus \{1, n\}$ for whom

$\varphi_i((\succeq'_n, \succeq_{-n}), X) = \{x_{n+1}\}$. This violates RP- π as i envies n . Therefore, $\varphi_1((\succeq'_n, \succeq_{-n}), X) = \{x_1, x_{n+1}\}$. Analogously, if $\varphi_n((\succeq'_n, \succeq_{-n}), X) \neq \{x_n\}$, then $\varphi_i((\succeq'_n, \succeq_{-n}), X) = \{x_n\}$ for some $i \in N \setminus \{1, n\}$ and agent i envies agent n , thereby violating RP- π . Thus, $\varphi_n((\succeq'_n, \succeq_{-n}), X) = \{x_n\}$. But then $\{x_n\} = \varphi_n((\succeq'_n, \succeq_{-n}), X) \succ_n^{PD} \varphi_n(\succeq, X) = \{x_{n+1}\}$, which violates WSP! ■

Proof of Theorem 3: Toward contradiction, suppose φ satisfies EFF, EF1, and WSP.

First consider the case with $n = 2$ agents. Given $X = \{a, b, c, d\} \subseteq \mathbb{O}$, let \succeq and \succeq' be preference profiles such that

$$\begin{aligned} \succeq_1 &= a, b, c, d, \dots; & \succeq'_1 &= b, d, a, c, \dots; \\ \succeq_2 &= b, a, d, c, \dots; & \succeq'_2 &= d, b, c, a, \dots \end{aligned}$$

Then EFF and EF1 imply that

$$\varphi(\succeq, X) = (\{a, c\}, \{b, d\}) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(\succeq', X) = (\{a, b\}, \{c, d\}).$$

By WSP for agent 2, we have $\varphi((\succeq_1, \succeq'_2), X) = (\{a, c\}, \{b, d\})$. But then

$$\varphi_1(\succeq', X) = \{a, b\} \succ_1^{PD} \{a, c\} = \varphi_1((\succeq_1, \succeq'_2), X),$$

which violates WSP for agent 1!

Using EFF, one can extend the above argument to the case with $n \geq 3$ agents by adding $2(n - 2)$ objects and $n - 2$ agents who bottom-rank the objects in $\{a, b, c, d\}$. ■

Proof of Theorem 4: Let $X = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and suppose, per contra, that φ satisfies NW, EF1, and SP. Consider two preference profiles \succeq and \succeq' such that $\succeq_1|_X = \succeq'_1|_X$ and $\succeq_2 = \succeq'_2$. SP implies that

$$\varphi_1(\succeq, X) \succeq_1^{PD} \varphi_1(\succeq', X) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_1(\succeq', X) \succeq_1'^{PD} \varphi_1(\succeq, X).$$

Because \succeq_1 and \succeq'_1 agree over X , we must have $\varphi_1(\succeq, X) = \varphi_1(\succeq', X)$. By NW, $\varphi_1(\cdot, X)$ and $\varphi_2(\cdot, X)$ partition X . Therefore, $\varphi(\succeq, X) = \varphi(\succeq', X)$. Iterating the argument for agent 2 leads to the conclusion that $\varphi(\cdot, X)$ does not depend on the ranking of objects in $\mathbb{O} \setminus X$.

For the remainder of this proof, we will adopt the following streamlined (but slightly abused) notation. Given a preference relation \succeq_i on \mathbb{O} , we denote its restriction to X by \succeq_i also. Moreover, if $\succeq_i|_X = x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5$, then we shall simply write $\succeq_i = x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5$. We will therefore speak of, for example, the (unique) allocation $\varphi((abcde, badce), X)$ associated with *any* preference profile whose restriction to X is $(abcde, badce)$.

Consider a preference profile $\succeq = (\succeq_1, \succeq_2)$, where $\succeq_1 = abcde$ and $\succeq_2 = badce$. By NW and EF1, we may assume without loss of generality that $|\varphi_1(\succeq, X)| = 3$ and $|\varphi_2(\succeq, X)| = 2$. Then

SP and NW imply that $|\varphi_1(\succeq', X)| = 3$ and $|\varphi_2(\succeq', X)| = 2$ for any preference profile \succeq' .

By NW and EF1, one has

$$\varphi(\succeq, X) \in \{(\{a, c, e\}, \{b, d\}), (\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\}), (\{b, c, e\}, \{a, d\}), (\{b, d, e\}, \{a, c\})\}.$$

Hence, there are four cases to consider.

Case 1: $\varphi(\succeq, X) = (\{a, c, e\}, \{b, d\})$.

Suppose $\succeq'_2 = baced$ and consider the allocation $\varphi((\succeq_1, \succeq'_2), X)$. Then SP for agent 2 implies that $\varphi_2((\succeq_1, \succeq'_2), X) \neq \{a, b\}$ and $\varphi_2((\succeq_1, \succeq'_2), X) \succeq_2'^{PD} \{b, d\}$. It follows that

$$\varphi_2((\succeq_1, \succeq'_2), X) \in \{\{b, c\}, \{b, d\}, \{b, e\}\}.$$

NW and EF1 imply that $\varphi_2((\succeq_1, \succeq'_2), X) \neq \{b, d\}$, and consequently

$$\varphi((\succeq_1, \succeq'_2), X) \in \{(\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\}), (\{a, c, d\}, \{b, e\})\}.$$

This gives two subcases.

Case 1a: $\varphi((\succeq_1, \succeq'_2), X) = (\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\})$. Suppose $\succeq''_2 = bcdea$ and consider the allocation $\varphi((\succeq_1, \succeq''_2), X)$. By SP for agent 2, we must have $\varphi_2((\succeq_1, \succeq''_2), X) = \{b, c\}$. Consequently, NW implies

$$\varphi((\succeq_1, \succeq''_2), X) = (\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\}).$$

Now suppose $\succeq'_1 = bcade$. By SP for agent 1, we must have $\{a, d, e\} \succeq_1'^{PD} \varphi_1((\succeq'_1, \succeq''_2), X)$, which means that

$$\varphi_1((\succeq'_1, \succeq''_2), X) \in \{\{a, d, e\}, \{b, d, e\}, \{c, d, e\}\}.$$

Hence, by NW,

$$\varphi((\succeq'_1, \succeq''_2), X) \in \{(\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\}), (\{b, d, e\}, \{a, c\}), (\{c, d, e\}, \{a, b\})\}.$$

But $\varphi((\succeq'_1, \succeq''_2), X) = (\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\})$ violates EF1 for agent 1, and similarly $\varphi((\succeq'_1, \succeq''_2), X) \in \{(\{b, d, e\}, \{a, c\}), (\{c, d, e\}, \{a, b\})\}$ violates EF1 for agent 2. This gives the desired contradiction.

The argument for Case 1a is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Case 1a

	$\succeq_2 = badce$	$\succeq'_2 = baced$	$\succeq''_2 = bcdea$
$\succeq_1 = abcde$	$(\{a, c, e\}, \{b, d\})$	$(\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\})$	$(\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\})$
$\succeq'_1 = bcade$	—	—	Contradiction

Case 1b: $\varphi((\succeq_1, \succeq_2), X) = (\{a, c, d\}, \{b, e\})$. Suppose $\succeq''_2 = bcdea$ and $\succeq'''_2 = bcda$. By NW, EF1, and SP for agent 2, we have

$$\varphi((\succeq_1, \succeq''_2), X) = (\{a, c, e\}, \{b, d\}) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi((\succeq_1, \succeq'''_2), X) = (\{a, c, d\}, \{b, e\}).$$

Now suppose $\succeq'_1 = bdace$ and consider the allocation $\varphi((\succeq'_1, \succeq''_2), X)$. By SP for agent 1, we must have $\{a, c, e\} \succeq_1^{PD} \varphi_1((\succeq'_1, \succeq''_2), X)$, hence

$$\varphi_1((\succeq'_1, \succeq''_2), X) \in \{\{a, c, e\}, \{a, d, e\}, \{b, c, e\}, \{b, d, e\}, \{c, d, e\}\}.$$

Only $\varphi_1((\succeq'_1, \succeq''_2), X) = \{a, d, e\}$ is compatible with EF1 and NW, so we must have

$$\varphi((\succeq'_1, \succeq''_2), X) = (\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\}).$$

Now consider the allocation $\varphi((\succeq'_1, \succeq'''_2), X)$. By SP for agent 2, we must have $\varphi_2((\succeq'_1, \succeq'''_2), X) = \{b, c\}$. Consequently, NW implies that

$$\varphi((\succeq'_1, \succeq'''_2), X) = (\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\}).$$

But this means that

$$\{a, c, d\} = \varphi_1((\succeq_1, \succeq'''_2), X) \succ_1^{PD} \varphi_1((\succeq'_1, \succeq'''_2), X) = \{a, d, e\},$$

which violates SP for agent 1. This is a contradiction.

The argument for Case 1b is summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Case 1b

	$\succeq_2 = badce$	$\succeq'_2 = baced$	$\succeq''_2 = bcdea$	$\succeq'''_2 = bcda$
$\succeq_1 = abcde$	$(\{a, c, e\}, \{b, d\})$	$(\{a, c, d\}, \{b, e\})$	$(\{a, c, e\}, \{b, d\})$	$(\{a, c, d\}, \{b, e\})$
$\succeq'_1 = bdace$	—	—	$(\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\})$	Contradiction

The argument for Cases 2–4 can be handled by finding a preference profile \succeq' which is, in some sense, “similar” to \succeq , and then applying the argument from Case 1. To see how, first

observe that the argument for Case 1 started from the allocation $\varphi(\succeq, X) = (\{a, c, e\}, \{b, d\})$ in which agent 1 receives bundle $\{a, c, e\}$ with object rankings $(1, 3, 5)$ at \succeq_1 , and agent 2 receives bundle $\{b, d\}$ with object rankings $(1, 3)$ at \succeq_2 . For each of Cases 2–4, we use the allocation $\varphi(\succeq, X)$ and the properties NW, EF1, and SP to find a preference profile \succeq' which is obtained from \succeq by permuting the names of the objects, and for which $\varphi_1(\succeq', X)$ has object rankings $(1, 3, 5)$ at \succeq'_1 and $\varphi_2(\succeq', X)$ has object rankings $(1, 3)$ at \succeq'_2 . We then apply the argument from Case 1 starting from the allocation $\varphi(\succeq', X)$, with the deviation preference relations suitably relabeled. The complete argument is illustrated in Case 2, while Cases 3 and 4 are left to the reader.

Case 2: $\varphi(\succeq, X) = (\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\})$.

Suppose $\succeq'_1 = abdce$ and $\succeq'_2 = bacde$. Then NW, EF1, and SP for agent 2 imply that

$$\varphi((\succeq_1, \succeq'_2), X) = (\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\}).$$

Similarly, NW, EF1, and SP for agent 1 imply that

$$\varphi(\succeq', X) = (\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\}).$$

So far, the allocations we have pinned down are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4: Case 2

	$\succeq_2 = badce$	$\succeq'_2 = bacde$
$\succeq_1 = abcde$	$(\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\})$	$(\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\})$
$\succeq'_1 = abdce$	—	$(\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\})$

Now, \succeq' is obtained from \succeq by interchanging the objects c and d in both agents' preferences. Moreover, bundle $\varphi_1(\succeq', X)$ has object rankings $(1, 3, 5)$ at \succeq'_1 and bundle $\varphi_2(\succeq', X)$ has object rankings $(1, 3)$ at \succeq'_2 . We now walk through the argument from Case 1, with objects c and d interchanged.

Suppose $\succeq_2^* = badec$ and consider the allocation $\varphi((\succeq'_1, \succeq_2^*), X)$. Then SP for agent 2 implies that $\varphi_2((\succeq'_1, \succeq_2^*), X) \neq \{a, b\}$ and $\varphi_2((\succeq'_1, \succeq_2^*), X) \succeq_2^{*,PD} \{b, c\}$. It follows that

$$\varphi_2((\succeq'_1, \succeq_2^*), X) \in \{\{b, c\}, \{b, d\}, \{b, e\}\}.$$

NW and EF1 imply that $\varphi_2((\succeq'_1, \succeq_2^*), X) \neq \{b, c\}$, and consequently

$$\varphi((\succeq'_1, \succeq_2^*), X) \in \{(\{a, c, e\}, \{b, d\}), (\{a, c, d\}, \{b, e\})\}.$$

This gives two subcases.

Case 2a: $\varphi((\succeq'_1, \succeq_2^*), X) = (\{a, c, e\}, \{b, d\})$. Suppose $\succeq_2^{**} = bdcea$. By SP for agent 2, we must have

$$\varphi_2((\succeq'_1, \succeq_2^{**}), X) = (\{a, c, e\}, \{b, d\}).$$

Now suppose $\succeq_1^* = bdace$. By SP for agent 1, we must have $\{a, c, e\} \succeq_1'^{PD} \varphi_1((\succeq_1^*, \succeq_2^{**}), X)$, which, together with NW, implies that

$$\varphi((\succeq_1^*, \succeq_2^{**}), X) \in \{(\{a, c, e\}, \{b, d\}), (\{b, c, e\}, \{a, d\}), (\{c, d, e\}, \{a, b\})\}.$$

But each of the possible allocations violates EF1, giving the desired contradiction. Table 5 summarizes the argument.

Table 5: Case 2a

	$\succeq'_2 = bacde$	$\succeq_2^* = badec$	$\succeq_2^{**} = bdcea$
$\succeq'_1 = abdce$	$(\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\})$	$(\{a, c, e\}, \{b, d\})$	$(\{a, c, e\}, \{b, d\})$
$\succeq_1^* = bdace$	–	–	Contradiction

Case 2b: $\varphi((\succeq'_1, \succeq_2^*), X) = (\{a, c, d\}, \{b, e\})$. Suppose $\succeq_2^{**} = bdcea$ and $\succeq_2^{***} = bdeca$. NW, EF1, and SP for agent 2 imply that

$$\varphi((\succeq'_1, \succeq_2^{**}), X) = (\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\}) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi((\succeq'_1, \succeq_2^{**}), X) = (\{a, c, d\}, \{b, e\}).$$

Now suppose $\succeq_1^* = bcade$. By SP for agent 1, $\{a, d, e\} \succeq_1'^{PD} \varphi_1((\succeq_1^*, \succeq_2^{**}), X)$, hence

$$\varphi_1((\succeq_1^*, \succeq_2^{**}), X) \in \{\{a, c, e\}, \{a, d, e\}, \{b, c, e\}, \{b, d, e\}, \{c, d, e\}\}.$$

Only $\varphi_1((\succeq_1^*, \succeq_2^{**}), X) = \{a, c, e\}$ is compatible with EF1 and NW, so

$$\varphi((\succeq_1^*, \succeq_2^{**}), X) = (\{a, c, e\}, \{b, d\}).$$

Now SP for agent 2 implies that $\varphi_2((\succeq_1^*, \succeq_2^{***}), X) = \{b, d\}$. Consequently, NW implies that

$$\varphi((\succeq_1^*, \succeq_2^*), X) = (\{a, c, e\}, \{b, d\}).$$

But this means that

$$\{a, c, d\} = \varphi_1((\succeq'_1, \succeq_2^{***}), X) \succeq_1'^{PD} \varphi_1((\succeq_1^*, \succeq_2^{***}), X) = \{a, c, e\},$$

which contradicts SP for agent 1. The argument is summarized in Table 6.

	$\succeq'_2 = bacde$	$\succeq_2^* = badec$	$\succeq_2^{**} = bdcea$	$\succeq_2^{***} = bdeca$
$\succeq'_1 = abdce$	$(\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\})$	$(\{a, c, d\}, \{b, e\})$	$(\{a, d, e\}, \{b, c\})$	$(\{a, c, d\}, \{b, e\})$
$\succeq_2^* = bcade$	—	—	$(\{a, c, e\}, \{b, d\})$	Contradiction

Case 3: $\varphi(\succeq, X) = (\{b, c, e\}, \{a, d\})$.

Suppose $\succeq'_1 = bacde$ and $\succeq'_2 = abdce$. Then NW, EF1, and SP for agent 2 imply that

$$\varphi((\succeq_1, \succeq'_2), X) = (\{b, c, e\}, \{a, d\}).$$

Similarly, NW, EF1, and SP for agent 1 imply that

$$\varphi(\succeq', X) = (\{b, c, e\}, \{a, d\}).$$

Note that \succeq' is obtained from \succeq by interchanging objects a and b in both agents' preferences. Moreover, bundle $\varphi_1(\succeq', X)$ has object rankings $(1, 3, 5)$ at \succeq'_1 and bundle $\varphi_2(\succeq', X)$ has object rankings $(1, 3)$ at \succeq'_2 . Therefore, the argument of Case 1 applies.

Case 4: $\varphi(\succeq, X) = (\{b, d, e\}, \{a, c\})$.

Suppose $\succeq'_1 = badce$ and $\succeq'_2 = abcde$. Then NW, EF1, and SP for agent 2 imply that

$$\varphi((\succeq_1, \succeq'_2), X) = (\{b, d, e\}, \{a, c\}).$$

Similarly, NW, EF1, and SP for agent 1 imply that

$$\varphi(\succeq', X) = (\{b, d, e\}, \{a, c\}).$$

Note that \succeq' is obtained from \succeq by interchanging objects a and b , in addition to objects c and d , in both agents' preferences. Moreover, bundle $\varphi_1(\succeq', X)$ has object rankings $(1, 3, 5)$ at \succeq'_1 and bundle $\varphi_2(\succeq', X)$ has object rankings $(1, 3)$ at \succeq'_2 . Hence, the argument of Case 1 applies. ■

Proof of Theorem 5: Without loss of generality, let π denote the identity priority. If $|X| < i$, then agent i does not receive an object at any preference profile and we are done. Assuming $|X| \geq i$, let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $(k-1)n + i \leq |X| < kn + i$, so that agent i receives a k -bundle at each preference profile.

Fix some $\succeq_i \in \mathcal{R}$ and suppose u_i is an additive utility function consistent with \succeq_i . Let $\succeq_{-i} \in \mathcal{R}^{N \setminus i}$ denote the profile such that $\succeq_j = \succeq_i$ for each $j \in N \setminus i$. Clearly, \succeq_{-i} solves the inner minimization problem at $\succeq'_i = \succeq_i$, i.e.,

$$\min_{\succeq'_{-i} \in \mathcal{R}^{N \setminus i}} u_i \left(\varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq_i, \succeq'_{-i} \right), X \right) \right) = u_i \left(\varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq_i, \succeq_{-i} \right), X \right) \right).$$

It follows that

$$\max_{\succeq'_{-i} \in \mathcal{R}^{N \setminus i}} \left[\min_{\succeq_{-i} \in \mathcal{R}^{N \setminus i}} u_i \left(\varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq'_{-i}, \succeq_{-i} \right), X \right) \right) \right] \geq u_i \left(\varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq_i, \succeq_{-i} \right), X \right) \right).$$

For the reverse inequality, it suffices to show that, for any $\succeq'_i \in \mathcal{R}$, one has

$$u_i \left(\varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq_i, \succeq_{-i} \right), X \right) \right) \geq \min_{\succeq'_{-i} \in \mathcal{R}^{N \setminus i}} u_i \left(\varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq'_i, \succeq'_{-i} \right), X \right) \right).$$

To this end, it is enough to show that, for any $\succeq'_i \in \mathcal{R}$,

$$\varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq_i, \succeq_{-i} \right), X \right) \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i} \right), X \right). \quad (5)$$

To prove (5), let $\succeq'_i \in \mathcal{R}$ and assume that

$$\varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq_i, \succeq_{-i} \right), X \right) = \{x_1 \succ_i \cdots \succ_i x_k\} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i} \right), X \right) = \{y_1 \succ_i \cdots \succ_i y_k\}.$$

To complete the proof, we argue by induction that $x_\ell \succeq_i y_\ell$ for each $\ell = 1, \dots, k$.

Base case ($\ell = 1$). Clearly, $x_1 \succeq_i y_1$, since in the draft procedure $\text{DRAFT}(\left(\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i} \right), X, f^\pi)$ the objects in $\{x \in X \mid x \succ_i x_1\}$ are assigned to the agents in $N \setminus \{i\}$ before agent i receives her first object.

Inductive step. Suppose that $x_\ell \succeq_i y_\ell$ for each $\ell = 1, \dots, m-1$, where $m \leq k$. We must show that $x_m \succeq_i y_m$.

Claim 4. If $\succeq_i^* \in \mathcal{R}$ is a preference relation that ranks object y_ℓ in the ℓ -th position ($\ell = 1, \dots, m$), i.e.,

$$\text{top}_{\succeq_i^*}(X, m) = \text{top}_{\succeq_i} \left(\varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i} \right), X \right), m \right) = \{y_1 \succ_i^* \cdots \succ_i^* y_m\},$$

then $\{y_1, \dots, y_{m-1}\} \subseteq \varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq_i^*, \succeq_{-i} \right), X \right)$.

Proof. We prove by induction that $\{y_1, \dots, y_\ell\} \subseteq \varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq_i^*, \succeq_{-i} \right), X \right)$ for each $\ell = 1, \dots, m-1$.

Base case ($\ell = 1$). Clearly, y_1 is available to agent i when she is assigned her first object in $\text{DRAFT}(\left(\succeq_i^*, \succeq_{-i} \right), X, f^\pi)$. Therefore, $y_1 \in \varphi_i^\pi \left(\left(\succeq_i^*, \succeq_{-i} \right), X \right)$.

Inductive step. Suppose $\{y_1, \dots, y_{t-1}\} \subseteq \varphi_i^\pi((\succeq_i^*, \succeq_{-i}), X)$ for some $t \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$. We must show that $y_t \in \varphi_i^\pi((\succeq_i^*, \succeq_{-i}), X)$.

Consider the step of $\text{DRAFT}((\succeq_i^*, \succeq_{-i}), X, f^\pi)$ at which agent i is assigned her t th object, i.e., step $s = (t-1)n + i$. Under the assumption that $x_\ell \succeq_i y_\ell$ for each $\ell = 1, \dots, m-1$ and $\{y_1, \dots, y_{t-1}\} \subseteq \varphi_i^\pi((\succeq_i^*, \succeq_{-i}), X)$, only the objects in $\{x \in X \mid x \succ_i x_t\}$ are assigned to the agents in $N \setminus \{i\}$ by this step. Therefore, y_t is available at step s of $\text{DRAFT}((\succeq_i^*, \succeq_{-i}), X, f^\pi)$, and consequently $y_t \in \varphi_i^\pi((\succeq_i^*, \succeq_{-i}), X)$. \square

Using Claim 4, we can now establish that $x_m \succeq_i y_m$. If $x_m \succeq_i y_{m-1}$, then $x_m \succeq_i y_{m-1} \succ_i y_m$ and we are done. So assume that $y_{m-1} \succ_i x_m$. By Claim 4, y_1, \dots, y_{m-1} are the first $m-1$ objects assigned to agent i in $\text{DRAFT}((\succeq_i^*, \succeq_{-i}), X, f^\pi)$. Moreover, in $\text{DRAFT}((\succeq_i^*, \succeq_{-i}), X, f^\pi)$, the objects in $\{x \in X \mid x \succ_i x_m\} \setminus \{y_1, \dots, y_{m-1}\}$ are assigned to the agents in $N \setminus \{i\}$ before agent i receives her m th object.³¹ Consequently, $y_m \notin \{x \in X \mid x \succ_i x_m\}$, i.e., $x_m \succeq_i y_m$.

It follows that $x_\ell \succeq_i y_\ell$ for each $\ell = 1, \dots, k$. Hence, (5) holds. \blacksquare

Proof of Proposition 3: The proof of Proposition 3 is almost identical to the proof of Proposition 1. For the sake of completeness, the details are provided below.

It is clear that EFF^* implies IR, NW^* , and RT. To see that IR, NW^* , and RT imply EFF^* , we prove the contrapositive: if φ violates EFF^* , then it violates one of IR, NW^* , and RT.

To this end, suppose φ is an allocation rule that violates EFF^* , but satisfies IR and NW^* . We will establish that φ violates RT. Since φ violates EFF^* , there is some problem (\succeq, X) and an allocation $A \in \mathcal{A}(X)$ such that $A_i \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$ for each $i \in N$ and $A_j \succ_j^{PD} \varphi_j(\succeq, X)$ for some $j \in N$. Without loss of generality we assume that A is individually rational at (\succeq, X) .³²

By IR and the definition of the pairwise dominance extension, for each $i \in N$ there exists an injection $\mu_i : \varphi_i(\succeq, X) \rightarrow A_i$ such that (i) $\mu_i(x) \succeq_i x$ for each $x \in \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$, and (ii) for each $k = 1, \dots, |\varphi_i(\succeq, X)|$, μ_i maps the k th best object in $\varphi_i(\succeq, X)$ to the k th best object in A_i (according to \succeq_i). Note also that, since $A_j \succ_j^{PD} \varphi_j(\succeq, X)$, there is some object $x \in \varphi_j(\succeq, X)$ such that $\mu_j(x) \succ_j x$.

Claim 5. $|A_i| = |\varphi_i(\succeq, X)|$ for each $i \in N$.

Proof. Since each μ_i is injective, we must have $|A_i| \geq |\varphi_i(\succeq, X)|$ for each agent $i \in N$. If $|A_i| > |\varphi_i(\succeq, X)|$ for some agent $i \in N$, then by IR, NW^* , and the fact that $A \in \mathcal{A}(X)$ is

³¹To see this, note that the agents in $N \setminus \{i\}$ always receive exactly $(n-1)(m-1) + (i-1)$ objects before agent i receives her m th object, and the set $\{x \in X \mid x \succ_i x_m\} \setminus \{y_1, \dots, y_{m-1}\}$ contains exactly $(n-1)(m-1) + (i-1)$ objects. Since $\succeq_j = \succeq_i$ for each $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$, one has $\bigcup_{j \in N \setminus \{i\}} (\{x \in X \mid x \succ_j x_m\}) = \{x \in X \mid x \succ_i x_m\}$. Therefore, the set of objects in $\{x \in X \mid x \succ_i x_m\}$ which are not allocated to agent i in $\text{DRAFT}((\succeq_i^*, \succeq_{-i}), X, f^\pi)$, namely $\{x \in X \mid x \succ_i x_m\} \setminus \{y_1, \dots, y_{m-1}\}$, must be assigned to the agents in $N \setminus \{i\}$ before agent i receives her m th object.

³²If this is not the case, then we can construct a new allocation $B = (B_i)_{i \in N}$ such that each B_i is obtained from A_i by removing all objects which are unacceptable at \succeq_i , i.e., $B_i = A_i \cap U(\succeq_i)$.

individually rational at (\succeq, X) , we have

$$|U(\succeq) \cap X| = |\varphi(\succeq, X)| = \sum_{i \in N} |\varphi_i(\succeq, X)| < \sum_{i \in N} |A_i| = |A| \leq |U(\succeq) \cap X|,$$

which is a contradiction. \square

Let $S := \bigcup_{i \in N} [A_i \setminus \varphi_i(\succeq, X)]$ be the set of objects allocated to different agents at $\varphi(\succeq, X)$ and A . We note that $S = \bigcup_{i \in N} [\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \setminus A_i]$, since $x \in A_i \setminus \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$ if and only if there is some agent i' for whom $x \in \varphi_{i'}(\succeq, X) \setminus A_{i'}$. It follows that $S \neq \emptyset$, for otherwise $A_i \subseteq \varphi_i(\succeq, X) \subseteq A_i$ for each $i \in N$, which contradicts the fact that $A \neq \varphi(\succeq, X)$.

Let $I := \{i \in N \mid A_i \neq \varphi_i(\succeq, X)\}$ denote the set of agents who receive different bundles at the allocations A and $\varphi(\succeq, X)$. Then $A_j \succ_j^{PD} \varphi_j(\succeq, X)$ implies $j \in I$, and consequently $I \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, $i \in I$ implies that $\text{top}_{\succeq_i}(S) \neq \omega$.³³

We define a bipartite directed graph D with vertex set $I \cup S$. Each vertex has exactly one outgoing arc: let each agent $i \in I$ point to object $\text{top}_{\succeq_i}(S) \in S$; let each object $x \in S$ point to the unique agent $i \in I$ for whom $x \in \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$.

Claim 6. For each agent $i \in I$, $\text{top}_{\succeq_i}(A_i \setminus \varphi_i(\succeq, X)) \succ_i \text{top}_{\succeq_i}(\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \setminus A_i)$.

Proof. Consider any agent $i \in I$. Since $A_i \neq \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$, by Claim 5 we must have $|A_i| = |\varphi_i(\succeq, X)| \geq 1$. So assume that $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) = \{x_1 \succ_i \cdots \succ_i x_k\}$ and $A_i = \{y_1 \succ_i \cdots \succ_i y_k\}$ for some $k \geq 1$. Then, the definition of μ_i implies that $\mu_i(x_\ell) = y_\ell$ for each $\ell = 1, \dots, k$.

Let ℓ^* be the smallest index such that $x_{\ell^*} \neq y_{\ell^*}$ (i.e., $x_{\ell^*} \neq y_{\ell^*}$ and $x_\ell = y_\ell$ whenever $1 \leq \ell < \ell^*$). Then $\mu_i(x_\ell) = y_\ell = x_\ell$ for $\ell < \ell^*$ and $y_{\ell^*} = \mu_i(x_{\ell^*}) \succ_i x_{\ell^*}$. Consequently, $x_{\ell^*-1} = y_{\ell^*-1} \succ_i y_{\ell^*} \succ_i x_{\ell^*}$, which means that $y_{\ell^*} \in A_i \setminus \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$.³⁴ By the choice of ℓ^* , we have $y_{\ell^*} = \text{top}_{\succeq_i}(A_i \setminus \varphi_i(\succeq, X))$.

Now consider any $z \in \varphi_i(\succeq, X) \setminus A_i$. Then $y_{\ell^*} \succ_i x_{\ell^*} \succeq_i z$, which implies that $y_{\ell^*} \succ_i \text{top}_{\succeq_i}(\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \setminus A_i)$. It follows that $\text{top}_{\succeq_i}(A_i \setminus \varphi_i(\succeq, X)) \succ_i \text{top}_{\succeq_i}(\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \setminus A_i)$, as claimed. \square

Since D is finite any each vertex has an outgoing arc, there exists a cycle, say $C = (x_1, i_1, \dots, x_k, i_k, x_1)$.

Claim 7. The number, k , of agents in the cycle C is at least 2.

Proof. Suppose otherwise. Then $C = (x_1, i_1, x_1)$ and $x_1 \in \varphi_{i_1}(\succeq, X) \setminus A_{i_1}$, which implies that $x_1 = \text{top}_{\succeq_{i_1}}(S) = \text{top}_{\succeq_{i_1}}(\varphi_{i_1}(\succeq, X) \setminus A_{i_1})$. Since $A_{i_1} \setminus \varphi_{i_1}(\succeq, X) \subseteq S$, one has $\text{top}_{\succeq_{i_1}}(S) \succeq_{i_1}$

³³If $A_i \neq \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$, then Claim 5 implies that $A_i \setminus \varphi_i(\succeq, X) \neq \emptyset$. Because A_i is individually rational at (\succeq, X) , each object in $A_i \setminus \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$ is acceptable. Hence, $\text{top}_{\succeq_i}(S) \succeq_i \text{top}_{\succeq_i}(A_i \setminus \varphi_i(\succeq, X)) \succ_i \omega$.

³⁴For the case $\ell^* = 1$, one has $y_1 \succ_i x_1$ and $y_1 \in A_i \setminus \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$.

$\text{top}_{\succeq_{i_1}}(A_{i_1} \setminus \varphi_{i_1}(\succeq, X))$. Consequently, $\text{top}_{\succeq_{i_1}}(\varphi_{i_1}(\succeq, X) \setminus A_{i_1}) \succeq_{i_1} \text{top}_{\succeq_{i_1}}(A_{i_1} \setminus \varphi_{i_1}(\succeq, X))$, which contradicts Claim 6. \square

By construction, the cycle C has the following properties:

1. For each $\ell = 1, \dots, k$, $x_\ell \in \varphi_{i_\ell}(\succeq, X) \setminus A_{i_\ell}$.

(Otherwise, $x_\ell \in \varphi_{i_\ell}(\succeq, X) \cap A_{i_\ell}$, which means that $x_\ell \notin S$, a contradiction.)

2. For each $\ell = 1, \dots, k$, $x_{\ell+1} \succ_{i_\ell} x_\ell$ (where x_{k+1} is interpreted as x_1).

(This relation holds because of the chain of relations

$$x_{\ell+1} = \text{top}_{\succeq_{i_\ell}}(S) \succeq_{i_\ell} \text{top}_{\succeq_{i_\ell}}(A_{i_\ell} \setminus \varphi_{i_\ell}(\succeq, X)) \succ_{i_\ell} \text{top}_{\succeq_{i_\ell}}(\varphi_{i_\ell}(\succeq, X) \setminus A_{i_\ell}) \succeq_{i_\ell} x_\ell,$$

where the strict preference holds by Claim 6 and the right-most relation holds because $x_\ell \in \varphi_{i_\ell}(\succeq, X) \setminus A_{i_\ell}$.)

3. For each $\ell = 1, \dots, k$, $i_\ell \neq i_{\ell+1}$ (where i_{k+1} is interpreted as i_1).

(This follows from Claim 7 and the fact that C is a cycle.)

Putting this all together, we have that $(i_1, x_1) \blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, \varphi(\succeq, X))} \dots \blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, \varphi(\succeq, X))} (i_k, x_k) \blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, \varphi(\succeq, X))} (i_1, x_1)$ is a cycle of $\blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, \varphi(\succeq, X))}$. Thus, φ violates RT! \blacksquare

Proof of Proposition 4: Suppose φ satisfies IR, TP, and EP. Given any problem (\succeq, X) and agent $i \in N$, let \succeq'_i be a truncation of \succeq_i such that $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \subseteq U(\succeq'_i)$. By TP, we have $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_i((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X)$, which means that

$$|\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \cap U(\succeq_i)| \geq |\varphi_i((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X) \cap U(\succeq_i)|.$$

On the other hand, EP implies that $\varphi_i((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X) \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$, which means that

$$|\varphi_i((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X) \cap U(\succeq'_i)| \geq |\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \cap U(\succeq'_i)|.$$

It follows from IR and our hypothesis about \succeq'_i that $\varphi_i((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X) \subseteq U(\succeq'_i) \subseteq U(\succeq_i)$ and $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \subseteq U(\succeq'_i) \subseteq U(\succeq_i)$. Consequently,

$$|\varphi_i((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X)| = |\varphi_i(\succeq, X)|. \quad (6)$$

If $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) = \emptyset$, then (6) implies that $\varphi_i((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X) = \emptyset$ and we're done. So we may assume that

$$\varphi_i(\succeq, X) = \{x_1 \succ_i \dots \succ_i x_k\} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_i((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X) = \{y_1 \succ_i \dots \succ_i y_k\}$$

for some $k \geq 1$.

Since $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_i((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X)$ and \succeq_i agrees with \succeq'_i on $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \cup \varphi_i((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X) \subseteq U(\succeq'_i)$, we have that $x_\ell \succeq_i y_\ell$ for each $\ell = 1, \dots, k$. By TP, also $\varphi_i((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X) \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_i(\succeq, X)$, which means that $y_\ell \succeq_i x_\ell$ for each $\ell = 1, \dots, k$. It follows that $x_\ell = y_\ell$ for each $\ell = 1, \dots, k$. That is, $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) = \varphi_i((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X)$, so φ satisfies TI. \blacksquare

Proof of Proposition 5: Without loss of generality, assume that π is the identity priority.

(EFF*) By Proposition 3, it suffices to show that φ^π satisfies IR, NW*, and RT. It is clear that IR and NW* hold. To verify RT, consider any problem (\succeq, X) and denote the binary relation $\blacktriangleright_{(\succeq, \varphi(\succeq, X))}$ by \blacktriangleright . Suppose, per contra, that $(i_1, x_1) \blacktriangleright \dots \blacktriangleright (i_k, x_k) \blacktriangleright (i_1, x_1)$ is a cycle of \blacktriangleright . Let $(s_k)_{k=1}^K$ be the sequence of selections associated with the draft procedure $\text{U-DRAFT}(\succeq, X, \pi)$. For each $\ell = 1, \dots, k$, let $t_\ell \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ be the step of the procedure in which object x_ℓ was assigned, i.e., $f^\pi(t_\ell) = i_\ell$ and $s_{t_\ell} = x_\ell$.

Since $x_2 \succ_{i_1} x_1$ and $x_1 \in \varphi_{i_1}^\pi(\succeq, X)$, object x_2 must have been allocated to agent i_2 at some step preceding the step at which x_1 was allocated to agent i_1 ; that is, $t_2 < t_1$. Since $x_3 \succ_{i_2} x_2$ and $x_2 \in \varphi_{i_2}^\pi(\succeq, X)$, object x_3 must have been allocated to agent i_3 at some step preceding t_2 ; that is, $t_3 < t_2$. Continuing in this fashion, we construct a sequence $(t_\ell)_{\ell=1}^k$ such that $t_k < t_{k-1} < \dots < t_2 < t_1$. But since $x_1 \succ_{i_k} x_k$ and $x_k \in \varphi_{i_k}^\pi(\succeq, X)$, object x_1 must have been allocated to agent i_1 at some step preceding t_k ; that is, $t_1 < t_k$, which is a contradiction. Hence, φ^π satisfies RT.

(RP- π) That φ^π satisfies RP- π is clear.

(EF1) To see that φ^π satisfies EF1, consider any problem (\succeq, X) and distinct agents $i, j \in N$ with $i < j$. It suffices to exhibit a set $S \subseteq \varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X)$ such that $|S| \leq 1$ and $\varphi_j^\pi(\succeq, X) \succeq_j^{PD} \varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X) \setminus S$. If $\varphi_j^\pi(\succeq, X) = \emptyset$, then the definition of φ^π implies that $|\varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X)| \leq 1$; hence, $S = \varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X)$ will do. So assume $\varphi_j^\pi(\succeq, X) \neq \emptyset$. Then we may write $\varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X) = \{x_1 \succ_i \dots \succ_i x_k\}$ and $\varphi_j^\pi(\succeq, X) = \{y_1 \succ_j \dots \succ_j y_\ell\}$ for some $\ell \geq 1$ and $k \leq \ell + 1$ (because $i < j$ and i could have been assigned the null object). In the draft procedure $\text{DRAFT}(\succeq, X, f^\pi)$, for each $t = 2, \dots, k$, object y_{t-1} was assigned to agent j before object x_t was assigned to agent i ; hence, $y_{t-1} \succ_j x_t$ for each $t = 2, \dots, k$. Consequently, $\varphi_j(\succeq, X) \succeq_j^{PD} \varphi_i(\succeq, X) \setminus \{x_1\}$, which means that EF1 holds.

(RM) By transitivity of \succeq_i^{PD} it suffices to show that, given a problem (\succeq, X) and an object $x \in \mathbb{O} \setminus X$, one has $\varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X \cup \{x\}) \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X)$ for each $i \in N$. Suppose $(s_k)_{k=1}^{|X|}$ is the sequence of selections associated with $\text{DRAFT}(\succeq, X, f^\pi)$, and $(s'_k)_{k=1}^{|X|+1}$ is the sequence of selections associated with $\text{DRAFT}(\succeq, X \cup \{x\}, f^\pi)$. We argue by induction that $X \cup \{x\} \setminus \{s'_1, \dots, s'_k\} \supseteq X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$ for each $k = 0, 1, \dots, |X| - 1$.

Base case ($k = 0$). Clearly, $X \cup \{x\} \setminus \emptyset \supseteq X \setminus \emptyset$.

Inductive step. Suppose $X \cup \{x\} \setminus \{s'_1, \dots, s'_{k-1}\} \supseteq X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\}$ for some $k \in$

$\{1, \dots, K-1\}$. We must show that $X \cup \{x\} \setminus \{s'_1, \dots, s'_k\} \supseteq X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$. Let $y \in X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$. The induction hypothesis implies that $X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \subseteq X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\} \subseteq X \cup \{x\} \setminus \{s'_1, \dots, s'_{k-1}\}$, which means that $y \in X \cup \{x\} \setminus \{s'_1, \dots, s'_{k-1}\}$. Let i be the agent who is assigned an object in step k of the draft procedure; that is, $i = f^\pi(k)$. Then

$$s'_k = \text{top}_{\succeq_i} (X \cup \{x\} \setminus \{s'_1, \dots, s'_{k-1}\}) \succeq_i \text{top}_{\succeq_i} (X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\}) = s_k \succ_i y,$$

which means that $s'_k \succ_i y$. Hence, $y \in X \cup \{x\} \setminus \{s'_1, \dots, s'_k\}$, as we needed to show.

Since $X \cup \{x\} \setminus \{s'_1, \dots, s'_k\} \supseteq X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$ for each $k = 1, \dots, K-1$, we have $s'_k \succeq_{f^\pi(k)} s_k$ for each $k = 1, \dots, K$. Therefore, RM holds.

(TP) Consider any problem (\succeq, X) . To see that φ^π satisfies TP, let \succeq'_i be a truncation of \succeq_i . The definition of φ^π and the fact that $U(\succeq'_i) \subseteq U(\succeq_i)$ imply that

$$\varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X) \cap U(\succeq'_i) = \varphi_i^\pi((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X).$$

Therefore, $\varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X) \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_i^\pi((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X)$ and TP holds.

(EP) Consider any problem (\succeq, X) . To see that φ^π satisfies EP, let \succeq'_i be an extension of \succeq_i . The definition of φ^π and the fact that $U(\succeq_i) \subseteq U(\succeq'_i)$ imply that

$$\varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X) = \varphi_i^\pi((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X) \cap U(\succeq_i).$$

Therefore, $\varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, X) \succeq_i^{PD} \varphi_i^\pi((\succeq'_i, \succeq_{-i}), X)$ and EP holds. ■

Proof of Theorem 7: It suffices to prove the “only if” direction. We will make use of the following lemma, which is the analogue of Lemma 2 in the present setting.

Lemma 5. *Suppose φ is an allocation rule satisfying RM. Consider a problem (\succeq, X) such that $\varphi(\succeq, X) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, X)$ for some priority π . If $x \in \mathbb{O} \setminus X$ is an object satisfying*

$$\text{for each } i \in N, \quad (y \succ_i x \text{ for each } y \in \varphi_i(\succeq, X)),$$

then $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \subseteq \varphi_i(\succeq, X \cup \{x\})$ for each $i \in N$.

Proof. Let $(s_k)_{k=1}^K$ be the sequence of selections associated with φ^π at (\succeq, X) . We show by induction that, for each $k = 1, \dots, K$, $s_k \neq \omega$ implies that $s_k \in \varphi_{f(k)}(\succeq, X \cup \{x\})$.

Base case ($k = 1$). If $s_1 \neq \omega$, then $s_1 \in \varphi_{f(1)}(\succeq, X)$. Since $s_1 = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f(1)}}(X)$, RM implies that $s_1 \in \varphi_{f(1)}(\succeq, X \cup \{x\})$.

Inductive step. Suppose that, for some $k \in \{2, \dots, K\}$, $s_\ell \in \varphi_{f(\ell)}(\succeq, X \cup \{x\})$ whenever $s_\ell \neq \omega$ and $1 \leq \ell < k$. We must show that $s_k \neq \omega$ implies that $s_k \in \varphi_{f(k)}(\succeq, X \cup \{x\})$.

Observe that the inductive hypothesis implies that $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \cap \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\} = \varphi_i(\succeq, X \cup \{x\}) \cap \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\}$ for each $i \in N$. If $s_k \neq \omega$, then $s_k \in \varphi_{f(k)}(\succeq, X)$. Since $s_k = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f(k)}}(X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\})$, RM implies that $s_k \in \varphi_{f(k)}(\succeq, X \cup \{x\})$.

It follows from the principle of induction that, for each $k = 1, \dots, K$, $s_k \neq \omega$ implies that $s_k \in \varphi_{f(k)}(\succeq, X \cup \{x\})$. Hence, $\varphi_i(\succeq, X) \subseteq \varphi_i(\succeq, X \cup \{x\})$ for each $i \in N$. \square

We are now ready to prove the characterization theorem. Without loss of generality, assume π is the identity priority. Let $f^\pi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow N$ denote the associated picking sequence, so that $(f^\pi(k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = (1, 2, \dots, n, 1, 2, \dots, n, \dots)$. Consider any problem (\succeq, X) and let \succeq' be the complete extension of \succeq . We must show that $\varphi(\succeq, X) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, X)$.

Let $(s_k)_{k=1}^K$ denote the sequence of selections associated with the draft procedure $\text{U-DRAFT}(\succeq, X, \pi)$. That is, $s_1 = \text{top}_{\succeq_1}(X)$ and $s_k = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f(k)}}(X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\})$ for each $k = 2, \dots, K$, where K is the smallest integer such that $s_{K-(n-1)} = s_{K-(n-2)} = \dots = s_{K-1} = s_K = \omega$. Let $S_0 := \emptyset$ and, for each $k = 1, \dots, K$, denote $S_k := \{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \setminus \{\omega\}$.

If $s_k = \omega$ for each k , then NW implies that $U(\succeq) \cap X = \emptyset$, that is, all objects in X are unacceptable to all agents. By IR, we have $\varphi(\succeq, X) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, X) = (\emptyset)_{i \in N}$. So we may assume that $s_k \neq \omega$ for some k .

Let \underline{k} be the first step such that $S_{\underline{k}} \neq \emptyset$, i.e., $s_k = \omega$ for $1 \leq k < \underline{k}$ and $s_{\underline{k}} \neq \omega$. For each $k = \underline{k}, \underline{k} + 1, \dots, K$, let

$$I_k := \{i \in N \mid \text{top}_{\succeq_i}(X \setminus S_{k-1}) \succ_i \omega\}$$

be the set of agents that find some object in $X \setminus S_{k-1}$ acceptable at \succeq , and let $\mathcal{I}_k := \mathcal{P}(I_k) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ denote the class of all coalitions of agents in I_k . An important observation is that $I_k \supseteq I_{k+1}$ and $\mathcal{I}_k \supseteq \mathcal{I}_{k+1}$ for each k .³⁵ We argue by induction that, for each $k = \underline{k}, \underline{k} + 1, \dots, K$, the following properties hold:

$$P_1(k): \quad \varphi(\succeq, S_k) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, S_k).$$

$$P_2(k): \quad \text{For each coalition } I \in \mathcal{I}_k, \varphi((\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}), S_k) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, S_k).$$

Base case ($k = \underline{k}$). We first verify $P_1(\underline{k})$. Since $s_k = \omega$ for $1 \leq k < \underline{k}$, the definition of the draft procedure $\text{U-DRAFT}(\succeq, X, \pi)$ implies that $\text{top}_{\succeq_k}(X) = \omega$ for $1 \leq k < \underline{k}$. Since $s_{\underline{k}} \neq \omega$ and $f^\pi(\underline{k}) = \underline{k}$, NW*, IR, and WRP*- π imply that $\varphi_{\underline{k}}(\succeq, S_{\underline{k}}) = \varphi_{\underline{k}}(\succeq, \{s_{\underline{k}}\}) = \{s_{\underline{k}}\}$ and $\varphi_i(\succeq, S_{\underline{k}}) = \emptyset$ for $i \in N \setminus \{\underline{k}\}$. Hence, $P_1(\underline{k})$ holds.

To verify $P_2(\underline{k})$, let $I \in \mathcal{I}_{\underline{k}}$. Since $\text{top}_{\succeq_i}(X) = \emptyset$ for each agent $i < \underline{k}$, agent \underline{k} is the highest priority agent in $I_{\underline{k}}$. Because object $s_{\underline{k}}$ is acceptable at $\succeq_{\underline{k}}$ and $\succeq'_{\underline{k}}$, it follows from NW*, IR, and WRP*- π that $\varphi_{\underline{k}}((\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}), S_{\underline{k}}) = \{s_{\underline{k}}\}$ and $\varphi_i((\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}), S_{\underline{k}}) = \emptyset$ for $i \in N \setminus \{\underline{k}\}$. Therefore, $\varphi((\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}), S_{\underline{k}}) = \varphi^\pi(\succeq, S_{\underline{k}})$ and $P_2(\underline{k})$ holds.

³⁵Since $S_k \subseteq S_{k-1}$, one has $\text{top}_{\succeq_i}(X \setminus S_{k-1}) \succeq_i \text{top}_{\succeq_i}(X \setminus S_k)$.

Inductive step. Suppose that $P_1(k-1)$ and $P_2(k-1)$ are true for some $k \in \{\underline{k}+1, \dots, K\}$. We must show that $P_1(k)$ and $P_2(k)$ are both true.

If $s_k = \omega$, then it is clear that properties $P_1(k)$ and $P_2(k)$ both hold (recall that $\mathcal{I}_k \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{k-1}$). So we assume that $s_k \neq \omega$. By the definition of s_k , we must have $s_k \succ_{f(k)} \omega$. We make two observations about $\varphi(\succeq, S_k)$.

First, observe that $P_1(k-1)$, RM, and Lemma 5 imply that

$$\varphi_i^\pi(\succeq, S_{k-1}) = \varphi_i(\succeq, S_{k-1}) = \varphi_i(\succeq, S_k) \setminus \{s_k\} \text{ for all } i \in N. \quad (7)$$

That is, all agents receive the same bundle at the allocations $\varphi^\pi(\succeq, S_{k-1})$ and $\varphi(\succeq, S_k)$, except possibly for one agent who receives object s_k at $\varphi(\succeq, S_k)$. Second, $P_2(k-1)$, RM, and Lemma 5 imply that

$$\varphi_i^\pi((\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}), S_{k-1}) = \varphi_i((\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}), S_{k-1}) = \varphi_i((\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}), S_k) \setminus \{s_k\} \text{ for all } i \in N, I \in \mathcal{I}_{k-1}. \quad (8)$$

In other words, whenever some coalition I of agents, each member of which finds an object in $X \setminus S_{k-2}$ acceptable, collectively extend their preferences to \succeq'_I , all agents receive the same bundle at the allocations $\varphi^\pi((\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}), S_{k-1})$ and $\varphi((\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}), S_k)$, except possibly for one agent who receives object s_k at $\varphi((\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}), S_k)$.

Step 1: $\varphi((\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}), S_k) = \varphi^\pi((\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}), S_k)$. By relation (8), it suffices to show that $s_k \in \varphi_{f^\pi(k)}((\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}), S_k)$.

Case 1. Toward contradiction, suppose that s_k is allocated to some agent j with higher priority than $f^\pi(k)$, i.e., $s_k \in \varphi_j((\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}), S_k)$ for some agent $j < f^\pi(k)$. Then IR implies that $s_k \succ_j \omega$, which means that agent j has received one more object than $f^\pi(k)$ by step $k-1$ of the draft procedure $\text{U-DRAFT}((\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}), S_{k-1}, \pi)$. Since $I_{k-1} \in \mathcal{I}_{k-1}$, (8) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi_j((\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}), S_k)| &= |\varphi_j((\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}), S_{k-1})| + 1 \\ &= |\varphi_{f^\pi(k)}((\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}), S_{k-1})| + 2 \\ &= |\varphi_{f^\pi(k)}((\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}), S_k)| + 2, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts EF1 at $((\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}), S_k)$ (because $f^\pi(k) \in I_{k-1}$ and all objects in $\varphi_j((\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}), S_k)$ are acceptable to agent $f^\pi(k)$ at $\succeq'_{f^\pi(k)}$).

Case 2. Toward contradiction, suppose that s_k is allocated to some agent j with lower priority than $f^\pi(k)$, i.e., $s_k \in \varphi_j((\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}), S_k)$ for some agent $j > f^\pi(k)$. Then IR

implies that $s_k \succ_j \omega$, which means that agent j has received the same number of objects as agent $f^\pi(k)$ by step $k-1$ of the draft procedure $\text{U-DRAFT}\left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}\right), S_{k-1}, \pi\right)$. Since $I_{k-1} \in \mathcal{I}_{k-1}$, (8) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \varphi_j \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}} \right), S_k \right) \right| &= \left| \varphi_j \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}} \right), S_{k-1} \right) \right| + 1 \\ &= \left| \varphi_{f^\pi(k)} \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}} \right), S_{k-1} \right) \right| + 1 \\ &= \left| \varphi_{f^\pi(k)} \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}} \right), S_k \right) \right| + 1, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts $\text{WRP}^*-\pi$ at $\left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}\right), S_k\right)$ because $f^\pi(k) \in I_{k-1}$.

By NW^* , we must have $s_k \in \varphi_{f^\pi(k)} \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}} \right), S_k \right)$.

Step 2: For each coalition $I \in \mathcal{I}_{k-1}$, $\varphi^\pi \left(\left(\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I} \right), S_k \right) = \varphi^\pi \left(\succeq, S_k \right)$. Consider any coalition $I \in \mathcal{I}_{k-1}$. Let \succeq^* be the preference profile in which every member i of I extends to \succeq'_i , i.e., $\succeq^* = (\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I})$. Let $(s_t^*)_{t=1}^T$ denote the (truncated) sequence of selections associated with the draft procedure $\text{U-DRAFT}(\succeq^*, S_k, \pi)$, where T denotes the latest step at which some agent was assigned a real object.³⁶

For each $t \in \{1, \dots, T-1\}$ such that $f^\pi(t) \in I$, we have $\text{top}_{\succeq_{f^\pi(t)}^*} (X \setminus S_{t-1}) = \text{top}_{\succeq'_{f^\pi(t)}} (X \setminus S_{t-1}) \succ_{f(t)} \omega$ (because $I \subseteq I_{k-1}$) and therefore $\text{top}_{\succeq_{f^\pi(t)}^*} (X \setminus S_{t-1}) = \text{top}_{\succeq'_{f^\pi(t)}} (X \setminus S_{t-1}) = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f^\pi(t)}} (X \setminus S_{t-1})$. For each $t \in \{1, \dots, T-1\}$ such that $f^\pi(t) \notin I$, we have $\text{top}_{\succeq_{f^\pi(t)}^*} (X \setminus S_{t-1}) = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f^\pi(t)}} (X \setminus S_{t-1})$. Therefore,

$$s_t^* = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f^\pi(t)}^*} (X \setminus S_{t-1}) = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f^\pi(t)}} (X \setminus S_{t-1}) = s_t \text{ for } t = 1, \dots, T-1.$$

Moreover, $f^\pi(T) \in I_T \subseteq I_{T-1}$ implies that $\text{top}_{\succeq_{f^\pi(T)}} (X \setminus S_{T-1}) \succ_{f^\pi(T)} \omega$; therefore

$$s_T^* = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f^\pi(T)}^*} (X \setminus S_{T-1}) = \text{top}_{\succeq_{f^\pi(T)}} (X \setminus S_{T-1}) = s_T.$$

It follows that $(s_t^*)_{t=1}^T = (s_t)_{t=1}^T = (s_t)_{t=1}^k$, which means that $\varphi^\pi \left(\left(\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I} \right), S_k \right) = \varphi^\pi \left(\succeq, S_k \right)$ as claimed.

Step 3: For each coalition $I \in \mathcal{I}_{k-1}$, $\varphi \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}} \right), S_k \right) = \varphi \left(\left(\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I} \right), S_k \right) = \varphi \left(\succeq, S_k \right)$. Consider any coalition $I \in \mathcal{I}_{k-1}$. We start by proving the first equality, i.e., $\varphi \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}} \right), S_k \right) = \varphi \left(\left(\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I} \right), S_k \right)$. If $I = I_{k-1}$, then the first equality holds trivially, so assume that $I \subsetneq I_{k-1}$ and consider any agent $i \in I_{k-1} \setminus I$.

³⁶That is, $(s_t^*)_{t=1}^{T+n}$ is the sequence of selections associated with $\text{U-DRAFT}(\succeq^*, S_k, \pi)$, and $s_t^* = \omega$ for $t = T+1, \dots, T+n$.

By Step 1, Step 2, and IR, one has $\varphi_i \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}} \right), S_k \right) = \varphi_i^\pi \left(\succeq, S_k \right) \subseteq U \left(\succeq_i \right)$. Therefore, \succeq_i is a truncation of \succeq'_i such that $\varphi_i \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}} \right), S_k \right) \subseteq U \left(\succeq_i \right)$. By TI, it holds that

$$\varphi_i \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}} \right), S_k \right) = \varphi_i \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}} \right), S_k \right). \quad (9)$$

Claim 8. $\varphi \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}} \right), S_k \right) = \varphi \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}} \right), S_k \right)$.

Proof. If $i \neq f^\pi(k)$, then agent $f^\pi(k)$ is a member of $I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}$, and an argument similar to that of Step 1 shows that $s_k \in \varphi_{f^\pi(k)} \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}} \right), S_k \right)$;³⁷ if instead $i = f^\pi(k)$, then, since $s_k \in \varphi_{f^\pi(k)}^\pi \left(\succeq, S_k \right)$, Step 2, Step 1, and (9) imply that $s_k \in \varphi_{f^\pi(k)} \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}} \right), S_k \right)$. In any case, agent $f^\pi(k)$ is assigned object s_k at the problem $\left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}} \right), S_k \right)$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{f^\pi(k)} \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}} \right), S_k \right) &= \varphi_{f^\pi(k)} \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}} \right), S_{k-1} \right) \cup \{s_k\} \\ &= \varphi_{f^\pi(k)}^\pi \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}} \right), S_{k-1} \right) \cup \{s_k\} \\ &= \varphi_{f^\pi(k)}^\pi \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}} \right), S_k \right) \\ &= \varphi_{f^\pi(k)}^\pi \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}} \right), S_k \right) \\ &= \varphi_{f^\pi(k)}^\pi \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}} \right), S_k \right), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the first equality follows from (8), the second from $P_2(k-1)$, the third from the definition of φ^π , the fourth from Step 2 and the last from Step 1. Similarly, for any agent $j \in N \setminus \{i, f^\pi(k)\}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_j \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}} \right), S_k \right) &= \varphi_j \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}} \right), S_{k-1} \right) \\ &= \varphi_j^\pi \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}} \right), S_{k-1} \right) \\ &= \varphi_j^\pi \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}} \right), S_k \right) \\ &= \varphi_j^\pi \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}} \right), S_k \right) \\ &= \varphi_j \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}} \right), S_k \right), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the first equality follows from (8), the second from $P_2(k-1)$, the third from the definition of φ^π , the fourth from Step 2, and the last from Step 1. By (9), (10) and (11), $\varphi \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}} \right), S_k \right) = \varphi \left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}} \right), S_k \right)$. \square

³⁷If object s_k is assigned to an agent $j < f^\pi(k)$, we get a violation of EF1 at $\left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}} \right), S_k \right)$; if s_k is assigned to an agent $j > f^\pi(k)$, we get a violation of WRP^{*} _{π} at $\left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}} \right), S_k \right)$.

One can continue changing the preferences of agents in $I_{k-1} \setminus I$, one at a time, to obtain

$$\varphi\left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}\right), S_k\right) = \varphi\left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}}\right), S_k\right) = \cdots = \varphi\left(\left(\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}\right), S_k\right). \quad (12)$$

This proves the first equality.

It remains to verify the second equality, i.e., $\varphi\left(\left(\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}\right), S_k\right) = \varphi\left(\succeq, S_k\right)$. To this end, consider any agent $i \in I \subseteq I_{k-1}$. Observe that, by (12), Step 1, and Step 2,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_i\left(\left(\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}\right), S_k\right) &= \varphi_i\left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}\right), S_k\right) \\ &= \varphi_i^\pi\left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}\right), S_k\right) \\ &= \varphi_i^\pi\left(\succeq, S_k\right), \end{aligned}$$

which is contained in $A(\succeq_i)$ because $\varphi^\pi(\succeq, S_k)$ is individually rational at (\succeq, S_k) . Therefore, \succeq_i is a truncation of \succeq'_i such that $\varphi_i\left(\left(\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}\right), S_k\right) \subseteq A(\succeq_i)$. By TI, it holds that

$$\varphi_i\left(\left(\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}\right), S_k\right) = \varphi_i\left(\left(\succeq'_{I \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I \setminus \{i\}}\right), S_k\right).$$

Proceeding as in the proof of Claim 8, one can show that $s_k \in \varphi_{f^\pi(k)}\left(\left(\succeq'_{I \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I \setminus \{i\}}\right), S_k\right)$ and $\varphi\left(\left(\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}\right), S_k\right) = \varphi\left(\left(\succeq'_{I \setminus \{i\}}, \succeq_{-I \setminus \{i\}}\right), S_k\right)$. As above, we continue changing the preferences of agents in I_k , one at a time, to obtain $\varphi\left(\left(\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}\right), S_k\right) = \varphi\left(\succeq, S_k\right)$.

Conclusion. Collecting results, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi\left(\succeq, S_k\right) &= \varphi\left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}\right), S_k\right) && \text{(by Step 3)} \\ &= \varphi^\pi\left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}\right), S_k\right) && \text{(by Step 1)} \\ &= \varphi^\pi\left(\succeq, S_k\right), && \text{(by Step 2)} \end{aligned}$$

so $P_1(k)$ holds. Moreover, for any coalition $I \in \mathcal{I}_k$, one has $I \in \mathcal{I}_{k-1}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi\left(\left(\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}\right), S_k\right) &= \varphi\left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}\right), S_k\right) && \text{(by Step 3)} \\ &= \varphi^\pi\left(\left(\succeq'_{I_{k-1}}, \succeq_{-I_{k-1}}\right), S_k\right) && \text{(by Step 1)} \\ &= \varphi^\pi\left(\left(\succeq'_I, \succeq_{-I}\right), S_k\right), && \text{(by Step 2)} \end{aligned}$$

which proves $P_2(k)$. By the principle of induction, $P_1(\ell)$ and $P_2(\ell)$ are true for all $\ell = \underline{k}, \underline{k} + 1, \dots, K$. In particular, $P_1(K)$ is true, which means that $\varphi\left(\succeq, X\right) = \varphi\left(\succeq, S_K\right) = \varphi^\pi\left(\succeq, S_K\right) = \varphi^\pi\left(\succeq, X\right)$. \blacksquare

Proof of Lemma 3: Consider any problem (N, X, \succeq) with $|X| \leq |N|$. By NW and EF1, there are $|X|$ agents in N who each receive singletons at $\varphi(N, X, \succeq)$. Call a problem (N, X, \succeq) with $|X| \leq |N|$ a *single-unit problem* in what follows.

Define a binary relation π on \mathbb{N} as follows. Let $i_1, i_2 \in \mathbb{N}$. If $i_1 = i_2$, then $i_1 \pi i_2$. If $i_1 \neq i_2$, then consider any distinct potential objects $a, b \in \mathbb{O}$. Consider the problems $E^1 = (\{i_1, i_2\}, \{a, b\}, \succeq^1)$ and $E^2 = (\{i_1, i_2\}, \{a, b\}, \succeq^2)$, where $\succeq^1 = (ab, ab)$ and $\succeq^2 = (ab, ba)$. By EF1 and EFF, each agent receives a singleton at $\varphi(E^1)$ and $\varphi(E^2)$; moreover, EFF implies that $\varphi(E^2) = (\{a\}, \{b\})$.³⁸ It follows that there are two possibilities for the pair of allocations $\varphi(E^1)$ and $\varphi(E^2)$.

Case 1. $\varphi(E^1) = (\{a\}, \{b\})$ and $\varphi(E^2) = (\{a\}, \{b\})$.

Case 2. $\varphi(E^1) = (\{b\}, \{a\})$ and $\varphi(E^2) = (\{a\}, \{b\})$.

By 2-NEU, the two cases are independent of the choice of a and b . Therefore, we define $i_1 \pi i_2$ if and only if Case 1 holds, and $i_2 \pi i_1$ if and only if Case 2 holds.

The binary relation π is complete because it is reflexive and, for any distinct $i_1, i_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, the two cases above are exhaustive. It is antisymmetric because, for any distinct $i_1, i_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, the two cases are mutually exclusive. To show that π is a linear order, we must show that π is transitive. First, we verify the following claim.

Claim 9. For distinct potential agents $i_1, i_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $i_1 \pi i_2$ if and only if the following holds: in any single-unit problem $E = (N, X, \succeq)$ with $\{i_1, i_2\} \subseteq N$, i_1 does not envy i_2 , i.e., $\varphi_{i_2}(E) \not\succeq_{i_1}^{PD} \varphi_{i_1}(E)$.

Proof. If i_1 does not envy i_2 at any single-unit problem, then clearly we have $i_1 \pi i_2$. For the converse, suppose toward contradiction that $E = (N, X, \succeq)$ is a single-unit problem such that $\{i_1, i_2\} \subseteq N$ and $\varphi_{i_2}(E) \succ_{i_1}^{PD} \varphi_{i_1}(E)$. Then $\varphi_{i_2}(E) \neq \emptyset$, say $\varphi_{i_2}(E) = \{x\}$.

Case A. Suppose $\varphi_{i_1}(E) \neq \emptyset$, say $\varphi_{i_1}(E) = \{y\}$. Then $x \succ_{i_1} y$. By 2-CON, for the reduced problem $E_{\{i_1, i_2\}} = (\{i_1, i_2\}, \{x, y\}, \succeq_{\{i_1, i_2\}}|_{\{x, y\}})$, we must have $\varphi(E_{\{i_1, i_2\}}) = (\{y\}, \{x\})$. EFF implies that $x \succ_{i_2} y$. Then $\succeq_{\{i_1, i_2\}}|_{\{x, y\}} = (xy, xy)$, so 2-NEU implies that $\varphi(E^1) = (\{b\}, \{a\})$, a contradiction.

Case B. Suppose $\varphi_{i_1}(E) = \emptyset$. By 2-CON, for the reduced problem $E_{\{i_1, i_2\}} = (\{i_1, i_2\}, \{x\}, \succeq_{\{i_1, i_2\}}|_{\{x\}})$, we must have $\varphi(E_{\{i_1, i_2\}}) = (\emptyset, \{x\})$. Let $y \in \mathbb{O} \setminus \{x\}$ and consider the problem $E' = (\{i_1, i_2\}, \{x, y\}, \succeq')$ with $\succeq' = (xy, xy)$. Then RM, NW, and EF1 imply that $\varphi(E') = (\{y\}, \{x\})$. Consequently, 2-NEU implies that $\varphi(E^1) = (\{b\}, \{a\})$, a contradiction.

³⁸Throughout this proof, we adopt the convention that the k th bundle listed is assigned to the agent with the k th smallest index. At $\varphi(E^2)$, $\{a\}$ is assigned to agent i_1 , while $\{b\}$ is assigned to i_2 .

□

We now show that π is transitive. Let i_1, i_2, i_3 be distinct agents in \mathbb{N} , and suppose that $i_1\pi i_2$ and $i_2\pi i_3$. Consider the single-unit problem $E = (\{i_1, i_2, i_3\}, \{a, b, c\}, \succeq)$, where $\succeq = (abc, abc, abc)$. By NW and EF1, each agent receives a singleton at $\varphi(E)$. Since $i_1\pi i_2$ and $i_2\pi i_3$, we must have $\varphi(E) = (\{a\}, \{b\}, \{c\})$. Now consider the reduced problem $E_{\{i_1, i_3\}} = (\{i_1, i_3\}, \{a, c\}, \succeq_{\{i_1, i_3\}|\{a, c\}})$. By 2-CON, we must have $\varphi(E_{\{i_1, i_3\}}) = (\{a\}, \{c\})$.

Toward contradiction, suppose that $\neg(i_1\pi i_3)$. By Claim 9, there is a single-unit problem $E' = (N', O', \succeq')$ such that $\{i_1, i_3\} \subseteq N'$ and $\varphi_{i_3}(E') \succ_{i_1}^{IPD} \varphi_{i_1}(E')$. Then $\varphi_{i_3}(E') \neq \emptyset$, say $\varphi_{i_3}(E') = \{x\}$.

Case A. Suppose $\varphi_{i_1}(E') \neq \emptyset$, say $\varphi_{i_1}(E') = \{y\}$. Then $x \succ'_{i_1} y$. By 2-CON, in the reduced problem $E'_{\{i_1, i_3\}} = (\{i_1, i_3\}, \{x, y\}, \succeq'_{\{i_1, i_3\}|\{x, y\}})$, we must have $\varphi(E'_{\{i_1, i_3\}}) = (\{y\}, \{x\})$. EFF implies that $x \succ'_{i_3} y$. Then $\succeq'_{\{i_1, i_3\}|\{x, y\}} = (xy, xy)$, so 2-NEU implies that $\varphi(E_{\{i_1, i_3\}}) = (\{c\}, \{a\})$, a contradiction.

Case A. Suppose $\varphi_{i_1}(E') = \emptyset$. By 2-CON, for the reduced problem $E'_{\{i_1, i_3\}} = (\{i_1, i_3\}, \{x\}, \succeq'_{\{i_1, i_3\}|\{x\}})$, we must have $\varphi(E'_{\{i_1, i_3\}}) = (\emptyset, \{x\})$. Let $y \in \mathbb{O} \setminus \{x\}$ and consider the problem $E'' = (\{i_1, i_3\}, \{x, y\}, \succeq'')$ with $\succeq'' = (xy, xy)$. Then RM, NW, and EF1 imply that $\varphi(E'') = (\{y\}, \{x\})$. Consequently, 2-NEU implies that $\varphi(E_{\{i_1, i_3\}}) = (\{c\}, \{a\})$, a contradiction.

Putting this all together, we have that $i_1\pi i_3$. That is, π is transitive and, hence, it is a priority on \mathbb{N} .

To conclude the argument, let (N, X, \succeq) be a problem with $|X| \leq |N|$. Suppose that $N = \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$, where $i_1\pi \dots \pi i_n$. By NW and Claim 1, $\varphi_{i_1}(N, X, \succeq) = \text{top}_{\succeq_{i_1}}(X) =: s_1$. A recursive argument shows that $\varphi_{i_2}(N, X, \succeq) = \text{top}_{\succeq_{i_2}}(X \setminus \{s_1\}) =: s_2$ and, more generally, $\varphi_{i_k}(N, X, \succeq) = \text{top}_{\succeq_{i_k}}(X \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}\}) =: s_k$ for each $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. That is, $\varphi(N, X, \succeq) = \varphi^\pi(N, X, \succeq)$. ■

Proof of Lemma 4: Suppose φ and π satisfy the stated properties. Let (N, X, \succeq) be any problem with $|X| > |N|$. We must show that $\varphi(N, X, \succeq) = \varphi^\pi(N, X, \succeq)$.

Suppose that $N = \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$ and $i_1\pi \dots \pi i_n$. Let $f_N^\pi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow N$ denote the picking sequence associated with π and N . For each $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, |X|\}$, let \mathcal{S}_k be the class of all k -subsets of X . Define the statement $P(k)$ as follows.

$P(k)$: for all $X_k \in \mathcal{S}_k$, $\varphi(N, X, \succeq|_{X_k}) = \varphi^\pi(N, X, \succeq|_{X_k})$.

We argue by induction on k that $P(k)$ is true for all $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, |X|\}$. Our hypothesis about φ implies that $P(k)$ is true for all $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For the inductive step, let $k \in$

$\{n, n+1, \dots, |X|-1\}$ be such that $P(\ell)$ is true for all $\ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. It is enough to show that $P(k+1)$ is true.

Let $X_{k+1} \in \mathcal{S}_{k+1}$. Let $(s_t)_{t=1}^{k+1}$ be the sequence of selections associated with $\text{DRAFT}(N, X_{k+1}, \succeq|_{X_{k+1}}, \pi)$. For each $t \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$, let $S_t = \{s_1, \dots, s_t\}$.

Since $S_k \in \mathcal{S}_k$, the induction hypothesis implies that $\varphi(N, S_k, \succeq|_{S_k}) = \varphi^\pi(N, S_k, \succeq|_{S_k})$. Moreover, $s_{k+1} \in \mathbb{O} \setminus S_{k-1}$ is an object such that $y \succ_i s_{k+1}$ for each $i \in N$ and each $y \in \varphi_i(N, S_k, \succeq|_{S_k})$. Consequently, RM^\dagger and a suitably modified version of Lemma 2 imply that

$$\varphi_i^\pi(N, S_k, \succeq|_{S_k}) = \varphi_i(N, S_k, \succeq|_{S_k}) \subseteq \varphi_i(N, S_{k+1}, \succeq|_{S_{k+1}}) = \varphi_i(N, X_{k+1}, \succeq|_{X_{k+1}}) \text{ for all } i \in N.$$

It remains to show that $s_{k+1} \in \varphi_{f_N^\pi(k+1)}(N, X_{k+1}, \succeq|_{X_{k+1}})$.

Since $S_n = \bigcup_{i \in N} \{\text{top}_{\succeq_i}(\varphi_i(N, X_{k+1}, \succeq|_{X_{k+1}}))\}$ and $|S_n| = n = |N|$, T-CON implies that

$$\varphi_{f_N^\pi(k+1)}(N, X_{k+1}, \succeq|_{X_{k+1}}) \setminus S_n = \varphi_{f_N^\pi(k+1)}(N, X_{k+1} \setminus S_n, \succeq|_{X_{k+1} \setminus S_n}).$$

But $X_{k+1} \setminus S_n \in \mathcal{S}_{k+1-n}$, so the induction hypothesis implies that

$$\varphi_{f_N^\pi(k+1)}(N, X_{k+1} \setminus S_n, \succeq|_{X_{k+1} \setminus S_n}) = \varphi_{f_N^\pi(k+1)}^\pi(N, X_{k+1} \setminus S_n, \succeq|_{X_{k+1} \setminus S_n}).$$

Since $s_{k+1} \in \varphi_{f_N^\pi(k+1)}^\pi(N, X_{k+1} \setminus S_n, \succeq|_{X_{k+1} \setminus S_n})$, we must also have $s_{k+1} \in \varphi_{f_N^\pi(k+1)}(N, X_{k+1}, \succeq|_{X_{k+1}}) \setminus S_n \subseteq \varphi_{f_N^\pi(k+1)}(N, X_{k+1}, \succeq|_{X_{k+1}})$. Therefore, $\varphi(N, X_{k+1}, \succeq|_{X_{k+1}}) = \varphi^\pi(N, X_{k+1}, \succeq|_{X_{k+1}})$, which means $P(k+1)$ is true. \blacksquare

References

- ABDULKADIROĞLU, A., AND T. SÖNMEZ (2003): “School Choice: A Mechanism Design Approach,” *American Economic Review*, 93, 729–747.
- AZIZ, H., S. BOUVERET, J. LANG, AND S. MACKENZIE (2017): “Complexity of Manipulating Sequential Allocation,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference of Artificial Intelligence* Volume 31: AAAI Press.
- BIRÓ, P., F. KLIJN, AND S. PÁPAI (2022a): “Balanced Exchange in a Multi-Unit Shapley-Scarf Market,” mimeo.
- (2022b): “Serial Rules in a Multi-Unit Shapley-Scarf Market,” *Games and Economic Behavior*, 136, 428–453.
- BOGOMOLNAIA, A., AND H. MOULIN (2001): “A New Solution to the Random Assignment Problem,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 100, 295–328.
- BORLAND, J., AND R. MACDONALD (2003): “Demand for Sport,” *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 19, 478–502.
- BOUVERET, S., AND J. LANG (2011): “A General Elicitation-Free Protocol for Allocating Indivisible Goods,” in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*: AAAI Press.
- (2014): “Manipulating Picking Sequences,” in *Proceedings of the Twenty-First European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 141–146.
- BRAMS, S. J., AND D. L. KING (2005): “Efficient Fair Division: Help the Worst Off or Avoid Envy?” *Rationality and Society*, 17, 387–421.
- BRAMS, S. J., AND P. D. STRAFFIN, JR (1979): “Prisoners’ Dilemma and Professional Sports Drafts,” *American Mathematical Monthly*, 86, 80–88.
- BUDISH, E. (2011): “The Combinatorial Assignment Problem: Approximate Competitive Equilibrium from Equal Incomes,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 119, 1061–1103.
- BUDISH, E., AND E. CANTILLON (2012): “The Multi-Unit Assignment Problem: Theory and Evidence from Course Allocation at Harvard,” *American Economic Review*, 102, 2237–71.
- BUTLER, M. R. (1995): “Competitive Balance in Major League Baseball,” *American Economist*, 39, 46–52.

- CARAGIANNIS, I., D. KUROKAWA, H. MOULIN, A. D. PROCACCIA, N. SHAH, AND J. WANG (2019): “The Unreasonable Fairness of Maximum Nash Welfare,” *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation*, 7, 1–32.
- CASPARI, G. (2022): “Booster draft mechanism for multi-object assignment,” *SSRN*, Available at SSRN: <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4213510>.
- CHUN, Y., AND W. THOMSON (1988): “Monotonicity Properties of Bargaining Solutions When Applied to Economics,” *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 15, 11–27.
- EHLERS, L., AND B. KLAUS (2003): “Coalitional Strategy-Proof and Resource-Monotonic Solutions for Multiple Assignment Problems,” *Social Choice and Welfare*, 21, 265–280.
- (2014): “Strategy-Proofness Makes the Difference: Deferred-Acceptance with Responsive Priorities,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 39, 949–966.
- ERGIN, H. I. (2000): “Consistency in house allocation problems,” *Journal of mathematical economics*, 34, 77–97.
- GILBOA, I., AND D. SCHMEIDLER (1989): “Maxmin Expected Utility with Non-Unique Prior,” *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 18, 141–153.
- GRIER, K. B., AND R. D. TOLLISON (1994): “The Rookie Draft and Competitive Balance: The Case of Professional Football,” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 25, 293–298.
- HASHIMOTO, T., D. HIRATA, O. KESTEN, M. KURINO, AND M. U. ÜNVER (2014): “Two Axiomatic Approaches to the Probabilistic Serial Mechanism,” *Theoretical Economics*, 9, 253–277.
- HATFIELD, J. W. (2009): “Strategy-Proof, Efficient, and Nonbossy Quota Allocations,” *Social Choice and Welfare*, 33, 505–515.
- HEATH, T. (2018): “How to Divvy Up the Inheritance—and Keep the Family Together,” *Washington Post*, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/how-to-divvy-up-the-inheritance/> 1 June 2018.
- HUMPHREYS, B. R. (2002): “Alternative Measures of Competitive Balance in Sports Leagues,” *Journal of Sports Economics*, 3, 133–148.
- KOHLER, D. A., AND R. CHANDRASEKARAN (1971): “A Class of Sequential Games,” *Operations Research*, 19, 270–277.

- LIPTON, R. J., E. MARKAKIS, E. MOSSEL, AND A. SABERI (2004): “On Approximately Fair Allocations of Indivisible Goods,” in *Proceedings of the 5th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, 125–131: Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, United States.
- MOULIN, H., AND W. THOMSON (1988): “Can Everyone Benefit from Growth?: Two Difficulties,” *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 17, 339–345.
- NEALE, W. C. (1964): “The Peculiar Economics of Professional Sports,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 78, 1–14.
- O’LEARY, B., B. GROFMAN, AND J. ELKLIT (2005): “Divisor Methods for Sequential Portfolio Allocation in Multi-Party Executive Bodies: Evidence from Northern Ireland and Denmark,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 49, 198–211.
- OZANIAN, M. (2023): “The NFL’s Most Valuable Teams 2023: Dallas Cowboys Remain on Top at a Record \$9 Billion,” *Forbes*, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/mikeozanian/2023/08/30/the-nfls-most-valuable-teams-2023-d> 30 August 2023.
- PÁPAI, S. (2000): “Strategyproof Multiple Assignment Using Quotas,” *Review of Economic Design*, 5, 91–105.
- (2001): “Strategyproof and Nonbossy Multiple Assignments,” *Journal of Public Economic Theory*, 3, 257–271.
- ROTH, A. E. (1985): “The College Admissions Problem Is Not Equivalent to the Marriage Problem,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 36, 277–288.
- ROTTENBERG, S. (1956): “The Baseball Players’ Labor Market,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 64, 242–258.
- SCHMIDT, M. B., AND D. J. BERRI (2001): “Competitive Balance and Attendance: The Case of Major League Baseball,” *Journal of Sports Economics*, 2, 101–207.
- SVENSSON, L.-G. (1994): “Queue allocation of indivisible goods,” *Social Choice and Welfare*, 11, 323–330.
- THOMSON, W. (2011): “Consistency and its converse: an introduction,” *Review of Economic Design*, 15, 257–291.
- (2012): “On the axiomatics of resource allocation: interpreting the consistency principle,” *Economics & Philosophy*, 28, 385–421.

TROYAN, P., AND T. MORRILL (2020): “Obvious Manipulations,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 185, 1–26.

WILLIS, S. J. (1999): “Judge Plays Solomon with Beanie Babies,” *Las Vegas Sun*, <https://lasvegassun.com/news/1999/nov/05/judge-plays-solomon-with-beanie-babies/>, 5 November 1999.