

The Price of Fairness in Bipartite Matching

Rémi Castera^{*1}, Felipe Garrido-Lucero^{*2}, Mathieu Molina^{*2}, Simon Mauras^{2,3}, Patrick Loiseau², and Vianney Perchet⁴

***Equal contribution**

¹Univ. Grenoble Alpes, Inria, CNRS, Grenoble INP, LIG, Grenoble, France

²Inria, FairPlay joint team, Palaiseau, France

³Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

⁴ENSAE, FairPlay joint team, Palaiseau, France

February 2024

Abstract

We investigate notions of group fairness in bipartite matching markets involving agents and jobs, where agents are grouped based on sensitive attributes. Employing a geometric approach, we characterize how many agents can be matched in each group, showing that the set of feasible matchings forms a (discrete) polymatroid. We show how we can define weakly-fair matchings geometrically, for which poly-matroid properties imply that they are maximal. Next, we focus on strong fairness notions (inspired by group-fairness metrics in machine learning), where each group gets their exact same fraction of their entitlement, and we explore the Price of Fairness (PoF), i.e., the loss in optimality when imposing such fairness constraints. Importantly, we advocate for the notion of opportunity fairness, where a group entitlement is the maximum number of agents that can be matched without the presence of other competing groups. We show that the opportunity PoF is bounded independently of the number of agents and jobs, but may be linear in the number of groups. Finally, we provide improved bounds with additional structural properties, or with stochastic graphs.

1 Introduction

Decision-makers are often faced with the intricate task of optimizing the allocation of potentially scarce resources or opportunities among a population. This challenge is faced in real-world applications such as dispatching students to universities [GS13], selling goods in markets [CS98], granting loans to businesses [dHRW00], or displaying online advertisement [Meh13]. Many of these allocation problems can be framed as matching problems, a theoretical model based on graph theory extensively studied in the economics [EIV23], operations research [Der88], and computer science literature [NRTV07]. The main goal is usually to efficiently find a “good” matching, where “good” is understood as maximizing some form of social welfare, for example matching the maximum number of individuals.

Matching problems, however, can also be highly sensitive. For instance, the European Union has recently proposed the creation of a job market matching platform between employers and migrants (European Commission press brief [Com23]) to address labor shortage. Migrants can belong to different demographic groups defined by sensitive or protected attributes such as age, race, gender, or wealth; and it is essential that matching decisions preclude discrimination across such groups. Hence, for such complex decision-making problems the definition of “good” matching cannot purely be based on utility requirements: ethical, political and legal considerations must be taken into account, and careful policies and allocations have to be designed to avoid harmful impact due to various forms of discrimination. In a similar vein, the global refugees resettlement crisis has reached new heights with more than 2 millions projected resettlement needs in 2023, a 35% increase from 2021 and 2022 according to the UNHCR [fr23]. As this is a pressing issue that affects increasingly larger populations, the way refugees are assigned to resettlement sites needs to be addressed carefully. This problem has recently received attention from the matching community (see [DKT23] and subsequent related works [FLP⁺23, AGP⁺21]). Again here, issues of discrimination across different demographic groups of refugees need to be addressed, be it for legal, ethical, or political reasons.

Discrimination issues are not limited to migrants job allocation or refugees resettlement: for any domain in society deemed critical for individuals such as health, finance, or employment to name but a few, the fairness of any decisions process is paramount. The matching literature has seen a rise in recent works pertaining to the conception and deployment of fair matching algorithms that prevent discrimination: [CLP22, KK23, DKSK23] examine the relationship between fairness and stable matching. In this paper, we focus on maximal matching rather stable matching. Closer to our setting, [CKLV19, BFIS23] propose algorithms that efficiently approximate optimal fair matchings, and many authors [MX20, MXX21, HHIS23, SSLNN21, BFIS23, EDN⁺22] consider fair matching in an online setting where individuals must be matched or discarded irrevocably once they become available.

For all the aforementioned papers, the goal is to compute, under different conditions, a matching that (approximately) solves the problem of maximizing the matching size under fairness constraints. In contrast, we focus on the diminution of the maximal matching size when imposing fairness constraints—that is, on comparing the solution with and without fairness constraints. Indeed, although fairness is desirable, fairness objectives are often not aligned with utility objectives and adding fairness constraints can decrease the value of optimal solutions. We focus on the Price of Fairness, a quantity that measures the loss in utility due to fairness requirements. The Price of Fairness has been studied in other problems of resource allocation [BFT11], kidney exchange [DPS14], and fair division [BLMS19]. In this paper, we study the Price of Fairness in the context of

maximal bipartite matching problems. We show that certain fairness notions incur no loss of utility, while others (inspired from fairness in machine learning) may have a Price of Fairness bounded or unbounded.

1.1 Our contributions

We consider a model of cardinal bipartite matching with agents and jobs, where fairness is required on the agents side. The agents are partitioned into K distinct protected groups based on sensitive attributes. For most of the applications mentioned, matching algorithms are deployed on a large market, hence fractional matchings can serve as good approximations. For this reason, we mainly work (except when stated otherwise) with fractional matchings.

First, we frame group fairness as a geometric problem, where each matching is represented by a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^K$ where x_i denotes the number of jobs matched to agents of group i . We characterize the set of feasible and maximum matchings as a polytope. Specifically, we show that the set of feasible matchings when taking into account the number of agents matched per group is a polymatroid – an intricate extension of (transversal) matroids. This implies that the Pareto frontier of the feasible matchings in \mathbb{R}^K , the set of maximal matchings, and the convex hull of all lexicographic maximal matchings are all equal. Hence many natural fairness notions, as for example the leximin egalitarian rule from fair division, can be achieved with a maximal matching at no utility loss. We also show, using again the structure of polymatroid, that such leximin optimal fair point satisfies additional properties like minimizing the variance of utility across groups.

Second, we introduce w -weighted group fairness notions, which seek to equalize the fraction of the entitlement w_i that each group receives. Compared to the leximin fairness, this stronger fairness notion does not allow for groups to be better off than others. Weighted fairness is quite flexible, and can encompass many fairness concepts inspired from the fair machine learning literature, such as demographic parity and equality of opportunity. In particular, we define opportunity fairness by setting w_i as the maximum number of agents from group i who can be matched. Defining the Price of Fairness (PoF) as the ratio between the optimum without and with fairness constraints (1 corresponds to no utility loss), we show that the worst case opportunity-PoF is equal to $K - 1$. This bound is independent of the number of jobs and agents in the graph (the size of the graph), and only depends linearly on the number of groups. As a significant consequence, any instance with only two groups has no diminution of the maximal matching size under opportunity fairness. Finally, we provide refined bounds under specific conditions such as (1) having a fixed ratio between the optimum and the ideal objective (so called nadir objective) or (2) having graphs sampled from an Erdős-Rényi model.

1.2 Further related works

Matchings and matroids In terms of techniques, our characterizations use tools from bipartite matching and matroid theory [Oxl22]. In a bipartite graph, sets of left endpoints of matchings form a transversal matroid, from which we can define the independence polytope (convex hull of feasible sets) and the basis polytope (convex hull of maximal sets). This corresponds to the special case of our model where groups have size 1. We show that this construction extends to arbitrary groups size, where the (transversal) matroid becomes a discrete polymatroid [HH02], and the independence polytope becomes a continuous polymatroid [Edm70]. Notably, **our work is the first to define this particular (discrete) polymatroid.**

Fairness in machine learning There is evidence that for some protected groups related to gender, age, or wealth, machine learning algorithms may lead to negative repercussions on online jobs offerings [SAV⁺18, LT19], image recognition [AHS19, WQK⁺19], or even judiciary decisions [LMKA16]. As a result, there has been a growing focus on the fairness of machine learning algorithms [MMS⁺19], with the two main definitions being individual fairness [DHP⁺12] and group fairness. Different notions of group fairness exist: *demographic parity* [BHN19] seeks statistical independence between some treatment (prediction in a classification task) and protected features, whereas *equality of opportunity* [HPS16] requires independence conditionally on some auxiliary positive treatment (true label of the same classification task). We take inspiration from both stream of literature to define our fairness metrics and apply them to the empirical distribution that results from the selected matching (see Section 5 for a closer comparison). While the typical relevant number of protected groups is usually small (often only 2), for some applications where the intersectionality between different sensitive features matter, the number of protected groups can increase exponentially fast leading to additional challenges [BG18, KNRW18, ML22]. As we consider protected groups forming a partition of the available agents, we implicitly place ourselves in such setting. Thus, dependence of our results in the number of protected groups can be crucial for practical applications.

Fair division An entire literature is dedicated to the fair division of items between K players, with guarantees either share-based (e.g., proportionality where each player gets a $1/K$ fraction of all items) or envy-based (e.g., envy-freeness where no player prefers the bundle allocated to another player). In mathematics, fair division emerged from the problem of dividing continuous goods, through the seminal works of Steinhaus [Ste49], who defined proportionality, and Foley [Fol66] and Varian [Var73], who defined envy-freeness, later generalized by Weller [Wel85].

More recently, computer scientists have considered the discrete version of the problem of sharing indivisible goods, with relaxations of share-based guarantees such as MMS [Bud11] and envy-based guarantees such as EF1 [LMMS04, Bud11] or EFX [CKM⁺19]. This framework is closely related to our setting where groups can be seen as players who benefit from bundles of jobs and have valuations given by the number of agents they can match. Looking closely at this reduction, the valuation of each player (group) is a matroid rank function for which improved guarantees can be obtained [BEF21, BCIZ21, BV22, VZ23]. Notably, these recent works propose efficient algorithms that select maximal size matchings which satisfy various fairness properties (leximin, EF1, MMS).

Our model distinguishes from these existing results as we consider a restricted continuous setting (fractional matchings) for which strong guarantees such as proportionality and envy-freeness are easily achievable, and for which we aim at a stronger fairness property by equalizing matching rates. In particular, we remark that our maximal fair fractional matching easily satisfies proportionality and envy-freeness.

2 Model

Consider a bipartite non-directed graph $G = (U, V, E)$, with U the set of **jobs**, V the set of **agents**, and $E \subseteq U \times V$ set of **edges**. We assume the graph G **known**.

The set of **feasible matchings** on the graph $G = (U, V, E)$, denoted by $\mathcal{M}(G)$, is defined as the family of all subsets of E that do not include two edges with common extremes. As equivalently

showed by Edmonds [Edm79], $\mathcal{M}(G)$ corresponds to all binary matrices $\mu \in \{0, 1\}^{|U| \times |V|}$ satisfying,

$$\forall u \in U, \sum_{v' \in V} \mu(u, v') \leq 1, \forall v \in V, \sum_{u' \in U} \mu(u', v) \leq 1, \text{ and } \mu(u, v) = 1 \implies (u, v) \in E.$$

We drop the dependence on G in any posterior definition. Notice from the matching definition that jobs and agents may remain unmatched. **Fractional matchings** are obtained when relaxing the integrality in the previous definition.

Agents are partitioned into K **groups**. Formally, we consider a family $\mathbf{V} = (V_1, \dots, V_K)$, where $V_i \cap V_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j \in [K]$, and $V = \bigcup_{i \in [K]} V_i$, with $[K] := \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$.

We will be interested in studying the number of agents matched per group by a given matching μ . In order to do it, we will consider the following **geometric approach**. Let $X : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$ be the mapping given by $\mu \mapsto X(\mu) = (X_1(\mu), X_2(\mu), \dots, X_K(\mu))$, where $X_i(\mu) := \sum_{u \in U} \sum_{v \in V_i} \mu(u, v)$ denotes the number of V_i -agents matched by μ . The mapping X captures **anonymity** as it does not keep track of the matched agents' identity but only the number of agents per group matched.

Definition 2.1. A point $x \in \mathbb{R}^K$ is **realizable** if there exists $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $X(\mu) = x$. We denote the set of **realizable points** in \mathbb{R}^K , i.e., the image set $X(\mathcal{M})$, as \mathbf{M}^1 . The mapping X being linear in each coordinate, the convex hull of \mathbf{M} corresponds to the image through X of the set of fractional matchings, i.e., $\text{co}(\mathbf{M})$ is the set of **fractional realizable points**.

The classical **maximum size matching problem** focuses on matching as many agents as possible given a graph G . Using the geometric approach, the set of **maximum size matchings** \mathcal{P} in the graph G can be written as

$$\mathcal{P} := \operatorname{argmax}_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^K X_i(\mu) \right\} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} \{ \|X(\mu)\|_1 \}.$$

The set \mathcal{P} is always non-empty due to the finiteness of the graph G . We denote \mathbf{P} its image through the map X , i.e., $\mathbf{P} = X(\mathcal{P})$. We denote by M_Λ the maximum number of agents of groups $\Lambda \subseteq [K]$ that can be ever matched, that is,

$$M_\Lambda := \max_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{i \in \Lambda} X_i(\mu), \quad \forall \Lambda \subseteq [K].$$

In particular, the maximum number of agents we can match is equal to $M_{[K]}$. Finally, we denote $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^K$ the i -th canonical vector.

We will now see how we can take into account the membership of agents in the maximization problem.

3 Geometry of Integral and Fractional matchings

The maximum size matching problem can actually be expressed as a multi-objective optimization problem (MOOP) given by the maximization of the number of agents matched for each group V_i , which corresponds to the maximization of all entries of the K -dimension vector $x \in \mathbf{M}$:

$$\max \{ x_1 \in \mathbb{R}, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \dots, x_K \in \mathbb{R} \mid x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_K) \in \mathbf{M} \},$$

¹Remark the notation for the sets \mathcal{M} and \mathbf{M} . A cursive capital letter will always represent a set of matrices, while a capital bold letter will always represent a set of points in \mathbb{R}^K .

As we will prove later, the set of maximal matchings \mathbf{P} will correspond to the Pareto-frontier of the set \mathbf{M} , which motivates its notation.

Hence, we dedicate this section to the characterization of the sets \mathbf{M} and \mathbf{P} and their convex hull, respectively.

3.1 The discrete polymatroid \mathbf{M}

The set \mathbf{M} results to be a discrete polymatroid [HH02], the generalization of matroids to multisets. Remark we are the first in the literature to study this construction for the set \mathbf{M} . The proof is a non-trivial extension of the fact that sets of agents who can be matched in some matching form a (transversal) matroid.

Theorem 3.1. *The set \mathbf{M} is a discrete polymatroid, that is,*

- Whenever $x \in \mathbb{N}^K$ and $y \in \mathbf{M}$ such that $x \leq y$ (coordinate wise), then $x \in \mathbf{M}$,
- Whenever $x, y \in \mathbf{M}$ and $\|x\|_1 < \|y\|_1$, there exists $i \in [K]$ such that $x_i < y_i$ and $x + e_i \in \mathbf{M}$.

Proof. The first point is direct as unmatching agents does not affect the realizability of a matching. To prove the second point, select two matchings $\mu \subseteq E$ and $\nu \subseteq E$ such that $x = X(\mu)$ and $y = X(\nu)$. First, we build the symmetric difference $\delta = \mu \Delta \nu$. Observe that δ is a subgraph where all vertices have degree at most 2 and, therefore, it corresponds to a collection of cycles and paths.

Because $\|x\|_1 < \|y\|_1$, the pigeon-hole principle implies the existence of at least one path with one endpoint v_1 in V and the other in U , such that v_1 is matched by ν . If v_1 is in group i_1 , then swapping the edges along the path shows that $x + e_{i_1}$ is feasible. However, notice that it does not necessarily hold that $x_{i_1} < y_{i_1}$ (see Figure 1 for an example).

To obtain i such that $x + e_i$ is feasible and $x_i < y_i$, we build the “exchange graph”, with one vertex per group $i \in [K]$, plus one special vertex 0.

- For each path in δ such that both endpoints are in V , we draw an arc from i to j , where i is the group of the endpoint matched by μ , and j is the group of the endpoint matched by ν .
- For each path in δ with exactly one endpoint in V , of group $i \in [K]$ and matched by μ , we draw an arc from i to 0.
- For each path in δ with exactly one endpoint in V , of group $i \in [K]$ and matched by ν , we draw an arc from 0 to i .

Notice that multiple edges may exist between two vertices. Starting at $i_0 = 0$, we pick the outgoing arc going to group i_1 , and we continue to build a path greedily, until to get stuck at some node i_ℓ as we have exhausted all outgoing arcs. First, observe $x + e_{i_\ell}$ is feasible (swap all the paths in δ corresponding to the arcs used in the exchange graph).

Second, we show that $x_{i_\ell} < y_{i_\ell}$. We denote by $\deg^-(i)$ (resp. $\deg^+(i)$) the in-degree (resp. out-degree) of node $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, K\}$. By construction, we have that $\deg^+(0) - \deg^-(0) = \|y\|_1 - \|x\|_1 > 0$, and that $\deg^+(i) - \deg^-(i) = x_i - y_i$ for each group $i \in [K]$. If we are stuck at i_ℓ , it is because $\deg^+(i_\ell) < \deg^-(i_\ell)$, i.e. because $x_{i_\ell} < y_{i_\ell}$. ■

Corollary 3.2. *The set \mathbf{P} of points in \mathbf{M} with maximum $\|\cdot\|_1$ corresponds to the Pareto frontier of \mathbf{M} , that is, the set of non-Pareto dominated points in \mathbf{M} .*




Figure 2: Sets \mathbf{M} , $P_\sigma, \forall \sigma \in \Sigma([K])$, and \mathbf{P} , for $K = 2$ and $K = 3$.

Corollary 3.5. For each permutation σ the point P_σ is equal to

$$P_\sigma = (M_{\sigma([i])} - M_{\sigma([i-1])})_{i \in [K]},$$

where $\sigma([i]) = \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(i)\}$ is the set containing the first i agents of σ .

Proof. Corollary of property (1) of Proposition 3.4. ■

Algorithm 1: Serial dictatorship

Input:

Graph G and permutation $\sigma \in \Sigma([K])$

Output:

The lexicographic maximum size point P_σ

1 Initialization:

2 $x \leftarrow 0_K \in \mathbb{R}^K$.

3 for $i \in [K]$ **do**

4 maximize $x_{\sigma(i)}$ such that x is feasible:

5 $x_{\sigma(i)} \leftarrow \max\{t \geq 0 \mid x + t \cdot e_{\sigma(i)} \in \mathbf{M}\}$

6 end

7 Return x .




Figure 3: Serial dictatorship, $K = 3$ and $\sigma = (132)$.

3.3 The polytope of fractional matchings

As Edmonds did for matchings [Edm79], we can characterize the convex hull of the set of realizable points \mathbf{M} as the intersection of finitely many hyperplanes. To do this, we show that the convex hull of \mathbf{M} is a polymatroid [Edm70], which generalizes the matroid polytopes to multisets.

Proposition 3.6. *The convex hull of \mathbf{M} , denoted $\text{co}(\mathbf{M})$, is a polymatroid, that is,*

- *Whenever $x \in \mathbb{R}^K$ and $y \in \text{co}(\mathbf{M})$ such that $x \leq y$ (coordinate wise), then $x \in \text{co}(\mathbf{M})$,*
- *Whenever $x, y \in \text{co}(\mathbf{M})$ and $\|x\|_1 < \|y\|_1$, there exists $i \in [K]$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $x_i < y_i$ and $x + \varepsilon e_i \in \text{co}(\mathbf{M})$.*

Proof. Using Theorem 3.1 and [HH02, Theorem 3.4]. ■

Proposition 3.7. *A point $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^K$ belongs to $\text{co}(\mathbf{M})$, the convex hull of the set \mathbf{M} , if and only if,*

$$\forall \Lambda \subseteq [K], \quad \sum_{i \in \Lambda} x_i \leq M_\Lambda.$$

Proof. Using Proposition 3.6 and [HH02, Proposition 1.2]. ■

Finally, we prove that the set of maximum size matchings corresponds to the convex combination of the lexicographic maximum size matchings.

Proposition 3.8. *The Pareto frontier $\text{co}(\mathbf{P})$ has the following characterizations.*

- *inequalities:* $\text{co}(\mathbf{P}) = \text{co}(\mathbf{M}) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^K : \sum_{i \in [K]} x_i = M_{[K]}\}$
- *extreme points:* $\text{co}(\mathbf{P}) = \text{co}(\{\mathbf{P}_\sigma : \sigma \in \Sigma([K])\})$

Proof. The characterization with inequalities follows from Proposition 3.7. To prove the characterization with extreme points, we use [BCT85, Theorem 2.4]. ■

As it will be shown when studying fair maximal matchings or the Price of Fairness (Section 6.1), working with fractional matchings will allow us to exploit the geometric properties of the set $\text{co}(\mathbf{P})$ and to bound the Price of Fairness even for graphs where the only integral fair matching will be the empty one. Therefore, for most of the fairness discussions, **we will relax the integrality condition** and focus on the polytope of fractional matchings.

4 The *fairest* optimal matching

Once seen that all Pareto optimal matchings have the same size, we turn our attention to the question of finding which of them is the “fairest” one. Indeed, due to the large number of options that the set of maximal matchings represents, there is an interest for the central planner to select only among those ones which satisfy some additional criteria, such as fairness. Therefore, we present two fairness notions which can always (for any graph) be guaranteed at no loss of optimality. For the two solution concepts, we propose their definitions and discuss their relative geometric, procedural, and axiomatic fairness.

1. Among all possible Pareto optimal matchings, one might be tempted to chose one *in the middle*. For that matter, we consider the barycenter of the extreme points of $\text{co}(\mathbf{P})$. The intuition behind the fairness of this point comes from two sources: (1) it corresponds to the expected output of the random serial dictatorship procedure which makes it algorithmically fair and (2) it guarantees each group their Shapley value in a given cooperative game, a standard notion from game theory, making it axiomatically fair.

2. One rule often used in social choice [Sen17] is the egalitarian rule (or Rawlsian fairness): the selected matching needs to maximize $\min_{i \in [K]} x_i$, i.e., the goal is to ensure that worse off groups do as good as possible. Due to the multiplicity of solutions, a tie-break rule is to choose the one simultaneously maximizing the second minimum. In case of having several options, the third minimum is considered, and so on. This solution concept is known as the leximin rule, which has also been studied in the social choice literature [DG77, DG78].

4.1 The Shapley fairness

Denote $v(\Lambda) = M_\Lambda$, for any $\Lambda \subseteq [K]$. The pair $([K], v)$ defines a cooperative-game with a sub-additive value function. A classical fair solution concept in cooperative game theory is the Shapley value where players are rewarded their average marginal contribution. Formally, we define the **Shapley value** φ_i of group $i \in [K]$ as,

$$\varphi_i := \frac{1}{K!} \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma([K])} M_{\sigma([i])} - M_{\sigma([i-1])}.$$

Notice that $M_{\sigma([i])} - M_{\sigma([i-1])} = (P_\sigma)_i$ corresponds to the number of V_i -agents matched after sequentially matching the agents in $V_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, V_{\sigma(i-1)}$. In particular, the vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^K$ given by $x_i = \varphi_i, \forall i \in [K]$, corresponds to the barycenter of the extremal points² P_σ of the set of maximal matchings, as illustrated in Figure 4.




Figure 4: Shapley value

We call to this vector the **Shapley matching**. The following proposition is immediate from the barycenter characterisation.

Proposition 4.1. *The vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^K$ defined by $x_i = \varphi_i, \forall i \in [K]$, is always realizable, it has maximum size, and it lies in the barycenter of the extreme points $\{P_\sigma, \forall \sigma \in \Sigma([K])\}$.*

²It is important to remark that the point $(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_K) \in \mathbb{R}^K$ corresponds to the barycenter of the extreme points of \mathbf{P} and not the barycenter of \mathbf{P} , as the multiplicity of these points must be considered if some of them coincide.

4.2 Leximin rule

Among the optimal points in \mathbf{P} , the leximin maximum matching will find an interesting algorithmic interpretation and many geometrical properties. We dedicate this section to its study.

Definition 4.2. Given $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^K$ and $i \in [K]$, we define $x_{(i)}$ as the i -th smallest coordinate of x . We define the *leximin* ordering $>_{\min}$ over \mathbb{R}_+^K , comparing sorted vectors lexicographically. Formally,

$$x >_{\min} y \iff (x_{(1)}, \dots, x_{(K)}) >_{\mathcal{L}} (y_{(1)}, \dots, y_{(K)}).$$

Using the fact that \mathbf{M} is convex and compact, the leximin preorder has a unique maximum [Beh77], which belongs to the Pareto frontier \mathbf{P} , and which we will denote P_{leximin} . This implies, in particular, that the leximin has maximum size.

Remark. Computing P_{leximin} amounts to taking $x \equiv 0_K \in \mathbb{R}^K$ and continuously increasing all entries at rate 1, until reaching a facet of \mathbf{M} , i.e., until a constraint in Proposition 3.7 becomes tight. Then, freezing all entries in this tight constraint, continue increasing the others. Repeat the procedure until reaching the Pareto frontier \mathbf{P} . This “waterfilling” algorithm is sometimes referred to as probabilistic serial [BM01]. We state its pseudo-code in Algorithm 2. Unlike most matroid problems, our setting allows to compute the maximal t and Λ in Algorithm 2 in **polynomial time** (through linear programming) as constraints come from a matching problem. Appendix B proves it formally.

Algorithm 2: Probabilistic serial

Input: Graph G .

Output: The leximin maximum point P_{leximin} .

1 **Initialization:**

2 $x \leftarrow 0_K \in \mathbb{R}^K$.

3 $S \leftarrow [K]$

4 **while** $S \neq \emptyset$ **do**

5 maximize t such that $x + t \cdot \mathbb{1}_S \in \text{co}(\mathbf{M})$,

6 $x \leftarrow x + t \cdot \mathbb{1}_S$.

7 for $\Lambda \subset [K]$ such that $\sum_{i \in \Lambda} x_i = M_\Lambda$,

8 $S \leftarrow S \setminus \Lambda$.

9 **end**

10 Return x .




Figure 5: Probabilistic serial, $K = 2$.

Proposition 4.3. P_{leximin} is the only point $x \in \mathbf{M}$ which maximizes each of the following objectives:

1. $\sum_{i \in [K]} \min(t, x_i)$, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$.
2. $\sum_{i \in [j]} x_{(i)}$, for all $j \in [K]$.
3. $\sum_{i \in [K]} \lambda_i x_{(i)}$, for all $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_K \geq 0$.

Proof sketch. Properties (2) and (3) are implied by the water filling maximization (1), which itself is a result of the augmentation property. The full proof is provided in Appendix C.2. ■

Proposition 4.4. The point $x = P_{\text{leximin}}$ is the unique point in \mathbf{P} that minimizes each of the following objectives:

1. $\|x\|_p$, for all $p > 1$.
2. $\mathbf{Var}(x) := \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i \in [K]} (x_i - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{\ell \in [K]} x_\ell)^2$

Proof sketch. Using Proposition 4.3 for $\mathbf{P}_{\text{leximin}}$, we can deduce that it majorizes all points in \mathbf{P} . By applying Karamata's inequality and the strict convexity of the norms considered, we can deduce the first result. The second result comes from all points in \mathbf{P} summing to the same quantity. The full proof is provided in Appendix C.3. ■

By the same arguments as above, the leximin optimal point also uniquely minimizes the Gini coefficient over \mathbf{P} as it is strictly Schur-Convex. An analogous property has been proved in the fair division literature [BEF21, BCIZ21], who show that in the integral setting, leximin minimizes symmetric strictly convex function (such as sum of squares) among all utilitarian optimal allocations. Here we show that this holds true when matchings are fractional, using a slightly different proof technique.

Denote $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ the vector with only ones. Interestingly, we can project back and forth between $F_1 := \{t\mathbf{1} \mid t \geq 0\}$ and \mathbf{P} depending on whether the fairest-optimal or the optimum fair point should be selected.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $x = \mathbf{P}_{\text{leximin}}$ and $y = t^*\mathbf{1}$, where $t^* = \max\{t \geq 0 \mid t\mathbf{1} \in \text{co}(\mathbf{M})\}$. It holds that x is the $\|\cdot\|_2$ projection on \mathbf{P} for any point in F_1 , and that y is the $\|\cdot\|_2$ projection on $F_1 \cap \text{co}(\mathbf{M})$ for any point in \mathbf{P} .*

Proof sketch. The proof relies on Proposition 4.4 and the fact that F_1 and \mathbf{P} are orthogonal. The full proof is provided in Appendix C.4. ■

In this work, we are interested in two (possibly competing) objectives: fairness and matching size. So far we have characterized some of the possible fair matchings among the maximal ones. The following section will focus on the opposite approach: fix a set of matchings which satisfy a given fairness property first and then, choose the largest one among those.

5 Fairness

A basic and straightforward fairness notion was presented in the previous section through F_1 by requiring to match all groups equally. However, this is unlikely to fit many use cases where the size of some groups might be much smaller than others, resulting in an important loss in optimality. We define a general class of fairness rules which are able to take into account the graph properties and to encompass many classical rules.

5.1 Weighted Fairness

Definition 5.1. Let $w = (w_i)_{i \in [K]} \in \mathbb{R}_+^K$ be a fixed weighted vector. We say that an element $x \in \mathbb{R}^K$ is **weighted-fair**, or simply **w-fair**, if for any $i, j \in [K]$,

$$\frac{x_i}{w_i} = \frac{x_j}{w_j}.$$

The set of w -fair points in \mathbb{R}^K is denoted \mathbf{F}_w . Notice that weighted-fairness can be represented in \mathbb{R}^K as the only line connecting the origin and the point (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_K) , as showed in Figure 6 for the following three examples of weighted-fairness notions.

1. **Egalitarian fairness:** for any $i \in [K]$, $w_i = 1$.
2. **Demographic fairness:** for any $i \in [K]$, $w_i = |V_i|$.
3. **Opportunity fairness:** for any $i \in [K]$, $w_i = M_i$.




Figure 6: Fairness notions

Relationship with fairness concepts of Section 4: Weighted-fairness is intricately linked to the Shapley fairness and leximin rule previously presented. Shapley fairness corresponds to considering weights $w_i = \varphi_i$ for any $i \in [K]$. Regarding the leximin rule, there are two possible interpretations. Firstly, extending the leximin notion to its weighted version where the objective is to sequentially maximize the entries of the vector $x^w := (x_i/w_i)_{i \in [K]}$ (the previous definition is recovered for egalitarian weights $w_i = 1$), it is clear that the optimum among all w -fair matchings corresponds to the one where all entries are equal to the minimum of the weighted leximin. Indeed, when running the water-filling process, instead of continuing to optimize other entries, the optimal w -fair matching stops at the first constraint saturation. Weighted fairness is, somehow, a *strong* fairness notion as no group envies the others' allocation based on their respective entitlements while the weighted leximin rule is a *weak* fairness notion that allows for some groups to be better off.

Remarkably, the set of fair matchings and the (sub)-set of optimal matchings are also linked geometrically through the leximin and the optimum among w -fair matchings: as can be seen in Proposition 4.5 for the egalitarian fairness, the projection of F_1 over the set of maximal matchings corresponds to the leximin point, while the projection of the maximal matchings over F_1 corresponds to the fair optimum. Thus, it is possible to *project back and forth* between the two notions. This is shown more generally for any $w > 0$ in Appendix A, where instead of maximal matchings, we work with the set of \mathbf{w} -weighted maximal matchings.

Weighted-fairness relates to group-fairness in Machine Learning when looking at predictions as selected matchings ($\hat{Y} = 1$ if the agent is matched) and true labels as entitlement (e.g., $Y = 1$ if the agent would be matched if only her group was present). For a group containing N_i agents, M_i of which could possibly be matched ignoring other groups, and x_i of them being currently

matched, then demographic parity corresponds to equalizing x_i/N_i (demographic fairness), and equal opportunity corresponds to equalizing x_i/M_i (opportunity fairness). This justifies the names selection for the corresponding weighted fairness notions.

5.2 Optimality Loss

The following measure is at the heart of our analysis and measures the loss on optimality suffered when weighted fairness constraints are imposed.

Definition 5.2. Given $w \in \mathbb{R}_+^K$ fixed, we define the w -Price of Fairness (PoF_w) as,

$$\text{PoF}_w = \frac{\max_{x \in \mathbf{M}} \|x\|_1}{\max_{x \in \mathbf{F}_w \cap \text{co}(\mathbf{M})} \|x\|_1}.$$

The set \mathbf{F}_w is always non-empty as the empty matching is always w -fair. Whenever $\mathbf{F}_w = \{0_{\mathbb{R}^K}\}$ we say that $\text{PoF}_w = \infty$. The weighted PoF, and more generally the PoF for any fairness notion defining a set \mathbf{F}_w that is closed and not reduced to a singleton, is bounded for fractional matchings. This is not always the case for integer matchings. We prove all this in Section 6.1.

We can also be interested in an additive difference between the optimum and fair optimum. Interestingly, for most fairness notions (even beyond weighted fairness), using the structure of the maximum matchings being exactly the Pareto optimal matchings, we can obtain a characterization of this additive gap in terms of L_1 distance between \mathbf{P} and $\mathbf{F} \cap \text{co}(\mathbf{M})$.

Proposition 5.3. *Let \mathbf{F} be a set of fair points that is closed and non-empty. Denote $\mathbf{H} := \mathbf{F} \cap \text{co}(\mathbf{M})$ and $d_1(\text{co}(\mathbf{P}), \mathbf{H}) := \inf_{(x,y) \in \text{co}(\mathbf{P}) \times \mathbf{H}} \|x - y\|_1$. It holds,*

$$d_1(\text{co}(\mathbf{P}), \mathbf{H}) = \max_{x \in \text{co}(\mathbf{M})} \|x\|_1 - \max_{y \in \mathbf{H}} \|y\|_1,$$

In addition, the infimum in $d_1(\text{co}(\mathbf{P}), \mathbf{H})$ is always attained.

Proof sketch. The proof is provided in Appendix C.5. ■

Nevertheless, one might be interested in exactly computing this additive gap or the PoF_w . The following section discusses how to efficiently (on the the graph size) do it.

5.3 Maximum size fair matching: A linear programming approach

The exact computation of the PoF_w for a given graph G and vector w is a polynomial problem on the size of G and on K . The computation of $\max_{x \in \mathbf{M}} \|x\|_1$ can be done through any maximum matching procedure, such as the Hungarian method [Kuh55]. To compute $\max_{x \in \mathbf{F}_w} \|x\|_1$, we present a linear programming formulation.

Let $w \in \mathbb{R}_+^K$ be a vector of weights. w -Fairness imposes that $\forall i, j \in [K]$, $x_i/w_i = x_j/w_j = c$, for c some constant. Having this in mind, any w -fair vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^K$ satisfies $x = (cw_1, cw_2, \dots, cw_K)$. In order to find a maximum size w -fair matching therefore, it is enough with solving the following linear program (LP),

$$\max \left\{ c > 0 \mid c \sum_{i \in \Lambda} w_i \leq M_\Lambda, \forall \Lambda \subseteq [K] \right\}. \quad (1)$$

The optimal value of the previous LP corresponds to,

$$c^* := \min_{\Lambda \subseteq [K]} \frac{M_\Lambda}{\sum_{i \in \Lambda} w_i}$$

and then,

$$\max_{x \in \mathbf{F}_w \cap \text{co}(\mathbf{M})} \|x\|_1 = c^* \sum_{i \in [K]} w_i.$$

Remark. Notice that under this formulation, computing c^* is exponential on the number of groups. However, our constraints come from an underlying matching problem and thus, it can be computed in **polynomial time** through a linear program having only a polynomial number of constraints, as demonstrated in Appendix B.

From an algorithmic point of view, Equation (1) can be interpreted as running Algorithm 2 with rates $(w_i)_{i \in [K]}$ and stopping at the first saturation of the constraints. Alternatively, by being able to compute all M_Λ efficiently, we can give an efficient oracle to the membership of $x \in \mathbf{M}$ in time $\mathcal{O}(2^K)$ using the characterization of \mathbf{M} given in Proposition 3.7.

This result can also be compared to the one in [CKLV19, BFIS23] who consider computationally harder problems with integral matching, and can provide approximations of $\max_{x \in \mathbf{F}_w \cap \mathbf{M}} \|x\|_1$ with an exponential dependency in K .

Once showed how to efficiently compute the PoF_w it remains the question of how large it can be. One major downside of Egalitarian and Demographic Fairness is the fact that they suffer by the disparity in the size of groups or the addition of isolated vertex to the graph. This is not an issue for the opportunity fairness notion which takes into account the whole graph structure. Because of this, we choose to extend the study of the opportunity PoF in the following section in its worst case setting and beyond.

6 Opportunity Price of Fairness

Recall a point $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^K$ is opportunity fair if it verifies

$$\frac{x_i}{M_i} = \frac{x_j}{M_j}, \forall i, j \in [K], \quad (2)$$

where M_i is the maximum number of V_i agents that can be ever matched. We denote \mathbf{F}_O to the set of opportunity fair points. We dedicate this section to study the Opportunity PoF in three settings: worst case, beyond the worst case, and random graphs.

6.1 Worst-case analysis

Opportunity fairness will achieve different results depending on the dimension of the problem, i.e., the number of groups K . Moreover, we start by showing that considering fractional matchings is crucial for the worst case analysis as the Opportunity-PoF (PoF_O) is known to remain always bounded (Proposition 5.3) while for integer matchings we can construct graphs where the only fair matching is the empty one, yielding an unbounded PoF_O .

Proposition 6.1. *For any constant $M > 0$, there exists a graph G such that the only element in $\mathbf{F}_O \cap \mathbf{M}(G)$ is the null vector $\mathbf{0}_K$, while there exists matchings $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ with $X(\mu) \geq M$.*

Proof. Take $K = 2$ and let M_1 and M_2 be two different prime numbers such that $M_1 + M_2 - 1 \geq M$. Consider a graph G with $M_1 - 1$ jobs connected to all agents in V_1 but no agent in V_2 , $M_2 - 1$ jobs connected to all agents in V_2 but no agent in V_1 , and one additional job connected with everybody, as in Figure 7 left. The maximum size matching has size $M_1 + M_2 - 1$. A point $x \in \mathbf{M}$ has both x_1 and x_2 in \mathbb{N} yet, as M_1 and M_2 are primes and different, for both coordinates to be integer and satisfy opportunity fairness, either $x = (0, 0)$ or $x = (M_1, M_2)$. Since $(M_1, M_2) \notin \mathbf{M}$, it holds $\mathbf{F}_O \cap \mathbf{M} = (0, 0)$. Figure 7 right illustrates these points. ■




Figure 7: Integral PoF_O

Proposition 6.1 implies the following result.

Corollary 6.2. *For integer matchings it holds $\sup_{G \text{ graph}} \text{PoF}_O(G) = \infty$.*

The issue exposed in Corollary 6.2 is solved when working with fractional matchings.

Theorem 6.3. *For fractional matchings, it holds that $\sup_{G \text{ graph}} \text{PoF}_O(G) = K - 1$.*

Proof. First let us show the upper bound. Suppose $\mathbf{F}_O \cap \text{co}(\mathbf{P}) = \emptyset$, otherwise $\text{PoF}_O = 1 \leq K - 1$. The PoF_O is given by,

$$\text{PoF}_O = \frac{M_{[K]}}{M_{\Lambda^*}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{i \in \Lambda^*} M_i}{\sum_{i \in [K]} M_i},$$

where Λ^* achieves the solution of Equation (1). Since $\mathbf{F}_O \cap \text{co}(\mathbf{P}) = \emptyset$, $\Lambda^* \neq [K]$. Setting $\lambda := \text{argmax}(M_i : i \in \Lambda^*)$, notice that $M_{\Lambda^*} \geq M_\lambda \geq \frac{1}{|\Lambda^*|} \sum_{i \in \Lambda^*} M_i$. Plugging this bound in the PoF_O definition, it follows,

$$\text{PoF}_O \leq |\Lambda^*| \cdot \frac{M_{[K]}}{\sum_{i \in \Lambda^*} M_i} \cdot \frac{\sum_{i \in \Lambda^*} M_i}{\sum_{i \in [K]} M_i} \leq |\Lambda^*| \leq K - 1,$$

where we have used that $M_{[K]} \leq \sum_{i \in [K]} M_i$ and $|\Lambda^*| \leq K - 1$ as $\Lambda^* \neq [K]$. To show the tightness of the bound, let M and N be two values. Consider next a graph where a group is independently connected to M jobs and $K - 1$ groups connected to N jobs at the detriment of the other groups (see Figure 8 for an example when $K = 3$). It holds,

$$\text{PoF}_O = \frac{M + N}{\frac{M}{K-1} + N} \xrightarrow{M \rightarrow \infty} K - 1. \quad \blacksquare$$

Theorem 6.3 implies the following remarkable result.

Corollary 6.4. *For any graph G with $K = 2$, $\text{PoF}_O(G) = 1$.*

This can also be derived from a simple geometrical argument as it can be proved that the Pareto frontier and the line $[(0, 0), (M_1, M_2)]$ always intersect. Unfortunately, as shown in Theorem 6.3 and illustrated by Figure 8 (μ_O^* denotes an opportunity fair maximum size matching), the property does not necessarily hold for larger values of K . Remark, however, that the worst case example relies on disparate maximum number of matchable agents among different groups. It seems intuitive that whenever the values $(M_i)_{i \in [K]}$ are restricted to be equal, we should rule out such a worst case example. This motivates a beyond worst case study for PoF_O under additional structure either on the parameters or on the geometry.




Figure 8: Toblerone graph

6.2 Beyond the worst case analysis

We start the analysis by considering upper bounds which depend on the relative opportunity levels of the groups $(M_i)_{i \in [K]}$.

Proposition 6.5. *The PoF_O is never greater than*

$$\frac{\max_{i \in [K]} M_i}{2 \min_{i \in [K]} M_i} + \frac{K}{4} \left(\frac{\max_{i \in [K]} M_i}{\min_{i \in [K]} M_i} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{4K} \mathbb{1}_{K \text{ odd}}. \quad (3)$$

Moreover, whenever $M_i = M_j$ for all $i, j \in [K]$, the bound is tight

Proof sketch. Consider the maximal opportunity-fair matching, the facet of $\text{co}(\mathbf{M})$ where it lies, and the set of indices corresponding to the facet. We express the PoF_O as a function of the cardinal of this subset and differentiate the obtained expression to find its maximum. The maximum being reached when the subset contains half of the groups, the upper bound is derived. The full proof is provided in Appendix C.6. ■




Figure 9: Set $\text{co}(\mathbf{M})$ shape. Left pyramid $\rho = 1/K$, right hyper-rectangle $\rho = 1$.

The previous bound concerns the size of the polytope \mathbf{M} . Alternatively, we study an upper-bound related to the geometry of \mathbf{M} captured by the parameter $\rho := M_{[K]} / \sum_{i \in [K]} M_i$, that is, the ratio between the size of a maximum size matching and the *ideal optimum*, the Utopian matching where each group gets as many matched agents as if they were the only group on the graph. It is direct that $\rho \in [1/K, 1]$ and that the extreme cases correspond to \mathbf{M} be shaped as an inverted pyramid ($\rho = 1/K$, Figure 9 left) with the origin as the top of the pyramid and \mathbf{P} as the pyramid basis, and as a hyper-rectangle ($\rho = 1$, Figure 9 right). In both cases, \mathbf{F}_O intersects \mathbf{P} independent on the value of K , yielding $\text{PoF}_O = 1$. The following proposition gives a quantitative result for intermediary cases where the geometry of \mathbf{M} differs from a perfect inverted pyramid or a hyper-rectangle.

Proposition 6.6. *Suppose that for all $i \in [K]$, $M_i = M > 0$, and let $\rho = \frac{M_{[K]}}{\sum_{i \in [K]} M_i} = \frac{M_{[K]}}{KM}$ be the rate between the size of a maximum size of matching and the size of the Utopian matching. If $\rho \in [\frac{1}{K}, \frac{1}{K-1}]$, then $\text{PoF}_O = 1$. Otherwise, for $\rho \in [\frac{1}{K-1}, 1]$, we have that*

$$\sup_{G \text{ s.t. } M_i = M, \rho \text{ is fixed}} \text{PoF}_O(G) = \rho \max \left(\frac{K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor + 1}{K\rho - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor + 1}, K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor \right) \leq \rho((1 - \rho)K + 1)$$

Proof sketch. The bound is showed by determining a lower bound on the quantity c^* as a function of ρ . The tight example is constructed from a continuous parametrization in terms of competition between groups from Figure 8. The proof is provided in Appendix C.7. \blacksquare

This tight bound is surprisingly multimodal as it can be seen in Figure 10. The tight bound is recovered when all values M_i are equal (Proposition 6.5) by simply maximizing the above bound over ρ . Notice that a slight modification of the proof generalizes the bound by taking into account the quantity $\max M_i / \min M_i$. However, the range for which the bound remains valid is smaller in $\max M_i / \min M_i$ than for Proposition 6.5.

Rather than deriving refined inequalities we prefer to find sufficient conditions to identify graphs with a PoF_O equal to 1. To do this, given $\sigma \in \Sigma([K])$, we denote $M^\sigma := \left(\frac{M_{\sigma([\ell])} - M_{\sigma([\ell-1])}}{M_{\sigma([\ell])}} \right)_{\ell \in [K]}$, where recall $M_{\sigma([\ell])}$ corresponds to the size of a maximum size matching when only considering the first ℓ groups on $\sigma([K])$.

Proposition 6.7. *Whenever all sequences $\{M^\sigma, \sigma \in \Sigma([K])\}$ are decreasing, it holds $\text{PoF}_O = 1$.*




Figure 10: Plot of maximum PoF_O and relaxed bound as a function of ρ for $K = 10$ and $M_i = M$

Proof sketch. From the sequence M^σ being decreasing, we can show that the function $\Lambda \subset [K] \mapsto M_\Lambda / \sum_{i \in \Lambda} M_i$ is decreasing in Λ . This implies that the set which solves Equation (1) is $[K]$, obtaining a PoF_O of 1. The proof is provided in Appendix C.8. ■

Proposition 6.7 gives a sufficient condition for a graph to have a PoF_O equal to 1. Notice that for $K = 2$, the sequences M^σ are always decreasing, recovering Corollary 6.4. Remark as well that, although sufficient, the condition is not necessary to obtain an opportunity PoF equal to 1. Indeed, consider a graph G with four groups, one agent per group, two jobs, such that V_1 and V_2 are connected to one of them, and V_3 and V_4 are connected to the other one. It holds $\text{PoF}_O(G) = 1$ and yet G has increasing sequences. Nonetheless, the monotonicity condition is useful to study, for instance, complete graphs.

Proposition 6.8. *Let G be a complete graph. Then, $\text{PoF}_O(G) = 1$.*

Proof sketch. To obtain this result, we show that M^σ is decreasing and apply the previous proposition. The proof is provided in Appendix C.9. ■

Real-life applications can rarely be modeled by worst case settings, even under extra structure as studied in this section. This motivates us to go beyond these approaches and to consider a stochastic setting with random graphs, as presented in the following section.

6.3 Stochastic model

We dedicate this sub-section to study the Opportunity Price of Fairness for Erdős-Rényi bipartite graphs and to determine regimes where a PoF_O equal to 1 is asymptotically³ achievable. We define a bipartite Erdős-Rényi graph with one side V of size n and another side U of size $\lfloor \beta n \rfloor$, for $\beta \in (0, 1)$ fixed and known, such that,

- for any $v \in V$, v belongs to the group V_i , for $i \in [K]$, with probability $\alpha_i \geq 0$, such that $\sum_{i \in [K]} \alpha_i = 1$. Each node in V is assigned to one and only one group,
- each node $v \in V_i$ has probability $p_i \in (0, 1)$, known and fixed, to be connected to each node in U , independently.

³Recall that classical results in random graphs are stated as the number of vertices grows to $+\infty$.

We denote $\mathbb{G}_{n,\beta,\vec{\alpha},\vec{p}} = (U, (V_i)_{i \in [K]}, E)$ to the random bipartite graph just described, where $\vec{\alpha} := (\alpha_i)_{i \in [K]}$ and $\vec{p} := (p_i)_{i \in [K]}$. For simplicity, we drop the indices and just denote \mathbb{G} to the Erdős-Rényi bipartite graph. We aim at characterizing the regimes for which $\text{PoF}_O(\mathbb{G}) = 1$. In order to do it, we recall in Appendices C.10 and C.11 two results from the literature of random graphs [FK16] which characterize, respectively, the edge probability for which random graphs become sparse, and for which random graphs become dense enough to ensure the existence of perfect matchings. We show that in both cases, with high probability, $\text{PoF}_O(\mathbb{G})$ is equal to 1.

Proposition 6.9. *Consider an Erdős-Rényi bipartite graph \mathbb{G} such that $\max_{i \in [K]} p_i \leq \frac{1}{\omega n^{3/2}}$ for $\omega = \omega(n) \rightarrow \infty$ arbitrarily slow as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, with high probability, $\text{PoF}_O(\mathbb{G}) = 1$.*

Proof sketch. The bipartite graph generated by $\max_{i \in [K]} p_i$ can be shown to be sparse using properties from random graphs. This implies that with high probability no two agents have the possibility of being matched to the same jobs. The proposition with respect to different p_i is implied by stochastic domination of the random graph with $\max_{i \in [K]} p_i$. The proof is provided in Appendix C.10. ■

Proposition 6.10. *Consider an Erdős-Rényi bipartite graph \mathbb{G} such that $p_i \geq \log^2(n)/n$ for any $i \in [K]$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\text{PoF}_O(\mathbb{G}) = 1) = 1$.*

Proof sketch. The proof goes as follows: First, we show $|V_i|$ concentrates around $\alpha_i \beta n$. Second, we show that $M_i = \min(\alpha_i \beta n, n)$. Third, we prove that for any $\sigma \in \Sigma([K])$, the sequence M^σ is decreasing by running Algorithm 1. We can then apply Proposition 6.7. See Appendix C.11 for the full proof. ■

7 Discussion

While we have focused on maximizing the cardinality of a bipartite matching with fairness constraints on the agents side, it is natural to consider various generalizations of this problem. In terms of utility objectives, it could be reasonable to consider weighted matching. If the edges weights are based on agents groups, this simply leads to a skewed polytope, and some results can be obtained (see Appendix A).

However, whenever the weights depend on the agents or on the edges, it is not clear whether similar general results can be obtained, as anonymity between agents and the augmentation property, which is crucial to the polymatroid structure, are both lost. Fairness requirements can also be modified to consider possible discrimination on both sides of the bipartite matching by assigning types to jobs, and seeking matchings such that the number of matched pairs between groups and types are equal for all possible pairs. This two-sided fairness unfortunately cannot be directly encoded into a larger bipartite graph, as it requires to take into account that jobs can only be matched once. Finally, a third possible generalization is on the structure of the problem, where general graphs are considered instead of bipartite graphs. Clearly, it also cannot be encoded into the setting studied in this paper for the same previously mentioned reasons.

References

- [AGP⁺21] Narges Ahani, Paul Gözl, Ariel D. Procaccia, Alexander Teytelboym, and Andrew C. Trapp. Dynamic placement in refugee resettlement. In *ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, 2021.

- [AHS19] Jamal Alasadi, Ahmed Al Hilli, and Vivek K. Singh. Toward fairness in face matching algorithms. 2019.
- [BCIZ21] Nawal Benabbou, Mithun Chakraborty, Ayumi Igarashi, and Yair Zick. Finding fair and efficient allocations for matroid rank valuations. 2021.
- [BCT85] Robert E Bixby, William H Cunningham, and Donald M Topkis. The partial order of a polymatroid extreme point. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 10:367–378, 1985.
- [BEF21] Moshe Babaioff, Tomer Ezra, and Uriel Feige. Fair and truthful mechanisms for dichotomous valuations. In *AAAI*, 2021.
- [Beh77] Fred Alois Behringer. Lexicographic quasiconcave multiobjective programming. *Zeitschrift für Operations Research*, 21:103–116, 1977.
- [BFIS23] Sayan Bandyapadhyay, Fedor V. Fomin, Tanmay Inamdar, and Kirill Simonov. Proportionally fair matching with multiple groups. In Daniël Paulusma and Bernard R. Ries, editors, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, 2023.
- [BFT11] Dimitris Bertsimas, Vivek F. Farias, and Nikolaos Trichakis. The price of fairness. *Oper. Res.*, 59:17–31, 2011.
- [BG18] Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru. Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. In *FAT*, 2018.
- [BHN19] Solon Barocas, Moritz Hardt, and Arvind Narayanan. *Fairness and Machine Learning*. fairmlbook.org, 2019.
- [BLMS19] Xiaohui Bei, Xinhang Lu, Pasin Manurangsi, and Warut Suksompong. The price of fairness for indivisible goods. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 2019.
- [BM01] Anna Bogomolnaia and Hervé Moulin. A new solution to the random assignment problem. *Journal of Economic theory*, 100:295–328, 2001.
- [Bud11] Eric Budish. The combinatorial assignment problem: Approximate competitive equilibrium from equal incomes. *Journal of Political Economy*, 119:1061–1103, 2011.
- [BV22] Siddharth Barman and Paritosh Verma. Truthful and fair mechanisms for matroid-rank valuations. In *AAAI*, 2022.
- [CKLV19] Flavio Chierichetti, Ravi Kumar, Silvio Lattanzi, and Sergei Vassilvitskii. Matroids, matchings, and fairness. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2019.
- [CKM⁺19] Ioannis Caragiannis, David Kurokawa, Hervé Moulin, Ariel D Procaccia, Nisarg Shah, and Junxing Wang. The unreasonable fairness of maximum nash welfare. 2019.
- [CLP22] Rémi Castera, Patrick Loiseau, and Bary S. R. Pradelski. Statistical discrimination in stable matchings. 2022.
- [Com23] European Commission. Commission proposes new measures on skills and talent to help address critical labour shortages. 2023.
- [CS98] Melvyn G. Coles and Eric Smith. Marketplaces and matching. *International Economic Review*, 39:239–254, 1998.

- [Der88] Ulrich Derigs. Solving non-bipartite matching problems via shortest path techniques. *Annals of Operations Research*, 13:225–261, 1988.
- [DG77] Claude D’Aspremont and Louis Gevers. Equity and the informational basis of collective choice. volume 44, pages 199–209, 1977.
- [DG78] Robert Deschamps and Louis Gevers. Leximin and utilitarian rules: A joint characterization. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 17:143–163, 1978.
- [DHP⁺12] Cynthia Dwork, Moritz Hardt, Toniann Pitassi, Omer Reingold, and Richard Zemel. Fairness through awareness. ITCS ’12, 2012.
- [dHRW00] Wouter J. den Haan, Garey Ramey, and Joel Watson. Liquidity flows and fragility of business enterprises. *Macroeconomics eJournal*, 2000.
- [DKSK23] Siddhartha Devic, David Kempe, Vatsal Sharan, and Aleksandra Korolova. Fairness in matching under uncertainty. In *ICML*, 2023.
- [DKT23] David Delacrétaz, Scott Duke Kominers, and Alexander Teytelboym. Matching mechanisms for refugee resettlement. *American Economic Review*, 2023.
- [DPS14] John P. Dickerson, Ariel D. Procaccia, and Tuomas Sandholm. Price of fairness in kidney exchange. In *Adaptive Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 2014.
- [Edm70] Jack Edmonds. Submodular functions, matroids, and certain polyhedra. *Combinatorial Structures and Their Applications*, pages 69–87, 1970.
- [Edm79] Jack Edmonds. Matroid intersection. In *Annals of discrete Mathematics*, volume 4, pages 39–49. Elsevier, 1979.
- [EDN⁺22] Seyed-Alireza Esmaeili, Sharmila Duppala, Vedant Nanda, Aravind Srinivasan, and John P. Dickerson. Rawlsian fairness in online bipartite matching: Two-sided, group, and individual. In *Adaptive Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 2022.
- [EIV23] Federico Echenique, Nicole Immorlica, and Vijay Vazirani. *Online and Matching-Based Market Design*. Cambridge University Press, 2023.
- [FF56] Lester Randolph Ford and Delbert R Fulkerson. Maximal flow through a network. *Canadian journal of Mathematics*, 8:399–404, 1956.
- [FK16] Alan Frieze and Michał Karoński. *Introduction to random graphs*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [FLP⁺23] Danielle N. Freund, Thodoris Lykouris, Elisabeth Paulson, Bradley Sturt, and Wen-Yu Weng. Group fairness in dynamic refugee assignment. In *ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, 2023.
- [Fol66] Duncan Karl Foley. *Resource allocation and the public sector*. Yale University, 1966.
- [fR23] United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Resettlement fact sheet 2023. 2023.
- [GS13] David Gale and Lloyd S. Shapley. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 120:386 – 391, 2013.
- [HH02] Jürgen Herzog and Takayuki Hibi. Discrete polymatroids. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 16:239–268, 2002.

- [HHIS23] Hadi Hosseini, Zhiyi Huang, Ayumi Igarashi, and Nisarg Shah. Class fairness in online matching. In *AAAI*, 2023.
- [HPS16] Moritz Hardt, Eric Price, and Nati Srebro. Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. 2016.
- [KK23] Yuichiro Kamada and Fuhito Kojima. Fair matching under constraints: Theory and applications. *Review of Economic Studies*, 2023.
- [KNRW18] Michael Kearns, Seth Neel, Aaron Roth, and Zhiwei Steven Wu. Preventing fairness gerrymandering: Auditing and learning for subgroup fairness. In *ICML*, 2018.
- [Kuh55] Harold W Kuhn. The hungarian method for the assignment problem. *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 2(1-2):83–97, 1955.
- [LMKA16] Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu, Lauren Kirchner, and Julia Angwin. How We Analyzed the COMPAS Recidivism Algorithm, 2016.
- [LMMS04] Richard J Lipton, Evangelos Markakis, Elchanan Mossel, and Amin Saberi. On approximately fair allocations of indivisible goods. In *ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, 2004.
- [LT19] Anja Lambrecht and Catherine E. Tucker. Algorithmic bias? an empirical study of apparent gender-based discrimination in the display of stem career ads. *Manag. Sci.*, 65:2966–2981, 2019.
- [Meh13] Aranyak Mehta. Online matching and ad allocation. *Found. Trends Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 8:265–368, 2013.
- [ML22] Mathieu Molina and Patrick Loiseau. Bounding and approximating intersectional fairness through marginal fairness. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [MMS⁺19] Ninareh Mehrabi, Fred Morstatter, Nripsuta Ani Saxena, Kristina Lerman, and A. G. Galstyan. A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 54:1 – 35, 2019.
- [MX20] Will Ma and Pan Xu. Group-level fairness maximization in online bipartite matching. In *Adaptive Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 2020.
- [MXX21] Will Ma, Pan Xu, and Yifan Xu. Fairness maximization among offline agents in online-matching markets. 2021.
- [NRTV07] Noam Nisan, Tim Roughgarden, Éva Tardos, and Vijay V. Vazirani. Algorithmic game theory. 2007.
- [Oxl22] James Oxley. Matroid theory. In *Handbook of the Tutte Polynomial and Related Topics*, pages 44–85. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2022.
- [SAV⁺18] Till Speicher, Muhammad Ali, Giridhari Venkatadri, Filipe Nunes Ribeiro, George Arvanitakis, Fabrício Benevenuto, Krishna P. Gummadi, Patrick Loiseau, and Alan Mislove. Potential for discrimination in online targeted advertising. In *FAT*, 2018.
- [Sen17] Amartya Sen. *Collective Choice and Social Welfare*. Harvard University Press, 2017.
- [SSLNN21] Govind S. Sankar, Anand Louis, Meghana Nasre, and Prajakta Nimbhorkar. Matchings with group fairness constraints: Online and offline algorithms. In *IJCAI*, 2021.

- [Ste49] Hugo Steinhaus. Sur la division pragmatique. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 315–319, 1949.
- [Var73] Hal R Varian. Equity, envy, and efficiency. 1973.
- [VZ23] Vignesh Viswanathan and Yair Zick. A general framework for fair allocation under matroid rank valuations. In *ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, 2023.
- [Wel85] Dietrich Weller. Fair division of a measurable space. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 14:5–17, 1985.
- [WQK⁺19] Zeyu Wang, Klint Qinami, Yannis Karakozis, Kyle Genova, Prem Qu Nair, Kenji Hata, and Olga Russakovsky. Towards fairness in visual recognition: Effective strategies for bias mitigation. 2019.

A Generalization of projection properties for weighted fairness and weighted leximin

Let us start this section by discussing a third possibility to define a ‘fairest’ optimal matching. Let $w = (w_1, \dots, w_K)$, with $w_i > 0, \forall i \in [K]$, be a vector of positive weights, corresponding to the entitlement of each group. Denote by $\frac{1}{w} = (\frac{1}{w_i})_{i \in [K]}$.

Definition A.1. We define \mathbf{P}^w as the set of weighted maximal matchings, that is,

$$\mathbf{P}^w := \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in \mathbf{M}} \left(\frac{1}{w} \right)^\top x. \quad (4)$$

Remark the set of maximal matchings corresponds to $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}^{\mathbf{1}}$.

We denote by $\Sigma^w([K]) \subseteq \Sigma([K])$ the set of permutations which are consistent with w , namely for any $\sigma \in \Sigma^w([K])$ and for any $(i, j) \in [K]^2$, $\sigma^{-1}(i) < \sigma^{-1}(j)$ if and only if $1/w_i \geq 1/w_j$. This ensures that whenever i appears before than j in σ , the weight associated to i is at least as high as the one of j . The number of permutations which are consistent with w depends on the number of unique weights values, and the number of groups which have this same unique value. More specifically,

$$|\Sigma^w([K])| = \prod_{u \in \{w_i | i \in [K]\}} |\{i | w_i = u\}|.$$

In particular, if all w_i are distinct, $\Sigma^w([K])$ is reduced to a singleton, while for equal weights $\Sigma^w([K]) = \Sigma([K])$.

We have the following property:

Proposition A.2. *The set of weighted maximal matchings is equal to the convex hull of the lexicographic maximal matchings for all w -consistent permutations. More precisely:*

$$\mathbf{P}^w = \operatorname{co}(\{P_\sigma | \sigma \in \Sigma^w([K])\}). \quad (5)$$

Proof. First, by Proposition 3.4 taking $\lambda_i = 1/w_i$, it is immediate that all points P_σ which are optimal for the weighted objective are exactly those with $\sigma \in \Sigma^w([K])$. Thus, the linearity of the mapping X implies that $\operatorname{co}(\{P_\sigma | \sigma \in \Sigma^w([K])\}) \subset \mathbf{P}^w$.

Conversely, as weights are positive, $\mathbf{P}^w \subseteq \mathbf{P}$. Since \mathbf{P} corresponds to the convex hull of all lexicographic maximum size points \mathbf{P}_σ , but those \mathbf{P}_σ with $\sigma \notin \Sigma^w([K])$ are sub-optimal, their coefficient on the convex combination must be necessarily zero, implying that $\mathbf{P} = \text{co}(\{\mathbf{P}_\sigma \mid \sigma \in \Sigma^w([K])\})$. ■

As points in \mathbf{P}^w are also maximal in the sense of cardinality, this provides another possible notion of fairness which induces no optimality loss. The less unique values of w , the smaller the dimension of \mathbf{P}^w is. Let us see how some of our results translate to these new weighted optimal maximizers. We denote by x^w the re-scaled point $(x_1/w_1, \dots, x_K/w_K)$, and for the definite positive matrix $D_w = \text{Diag}(1/w)$, the associated norm $\|x\|_w = x^\top D_w^\top D_w x$. Let $\mathbf{P}_{\text{leximin}}^w$ be the w -weighted leximin maximum point. By considering the scaled fractional polytope $\mathbf{M}^w := \{x^w \mid x \in \mathbf{M}\}$, it is clear that the augmentation property of Proposition 3.6 still applies, hence the set of maximal points \mathbf{P}^w is exactly the Pareto frontier in \mathbf{M}^w . Because the weighted leximin optimal matching belongs to the Pareto frontier of \mathbf{M}^w , by definition, it is also maximal and therefore, it belongs to \mathbf{P}^w . We are ready to state the generalization of Proposition 4.4.

Proposition A.3. *The point $x = \mathbf{P}_{\text{leximin}}^w \in \mathbf{P}^w$ is the unique point that minimizes each of the following objectives among all points in \mathbf{P}^w :*

1. $\|x\|_w = x^\top D_w^\top D_w x$.
2. $\text{Var}(x) := \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i \in [K]} \left(\frac{x_i}{w_i} - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{\ell \in [K]} \frac{x_\ell}{w_\ell}\right)^2$

Proof. The proof is identical as in the main body: (1) It can be shown that for any point $z \in \mathbf{P}^w$ it holds $\|z\|_w \geq \|x\|_w$, (2) all points in \mathbf{P}^w sum up the same as x^w , and (3) $\|x\|_w^2 = \sum_{i \in [K]} (x_i/w_i)^2$. The second point follows similarly. ■

The projection property can also be extended, with the correspondent proof by scaling the vectors by w .

Proposition A.4. *The $\|\cdot\|_w$ -projection of \mathbf{P}^w onto \mathbf{F}_w is the fair optimum $y = t^*w$ where $t^* = \max\{t \geq 0 \mid tw \in \text{co}(\mathbf{M})\}$, and the $\|\cdot\|_w$ -projection of \mathbf{F}_w onto \mathbf{P}^w is $\mathbf{P}_{\text{leximin}}^w$.*

We observe that \mathbf{P}^w and \mathbf{F}_w , when projected one on another with $\|\cdot\|_w$, it reduces to either the fair optimum or the optimum fair. The main difference compared to $w = \mathbf{1}$, is that a different distance is used as we scale the polytope by w .

B Computational remarks

In this section, we show that several computational tasks involving fractional matching can be performed in polynomial time, using a linear programming approach. First, recall that X is a linear mapping that maps fractional matchings $\mu \in \text{co}(\mathcal{M})$ to the corresponding points $X(\mu) \in \text{co}(\mathbf{M})$. A natural question is: given $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^K$, can we decide in polynomial time if $x \in \text{co}(\mathbf{M})$, and if so can we build a fractional matching μ such that $X(\mu) = x$?

Proposition B.1. *Given $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^K$, there exists a fractional matching $\mu \in \text{co}(\mathcal{M})$ such that $X(\mu) = x$ if and only if the following linear program has a feasible solution with value $\|x\|_1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{u \in U} \sum_{v \in V} \mu_{u,v} \\ & \text{such that} && 0 \leq \mu_{u,v} \leq \mathbb{1}_{\{(u,v) \in E\}} \quad (\forall u \in U, v \in V) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{u \in U} \mu_{u,v} &\leq 1 && (\forall v \in V) \\
\sum_{v \in V} \mu_{u,v} &\leq 1 && (\forall u \in U) \\
\sum_{v \in V_i} \sum_{u \in U} \mu_{u,v} &= x_i && (\forall i \in [K])
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof follows from the definition of X . ■

Next, in various settings (to compute the leximin optimal, or a maximal fair matching), we want to start from a point $x \in \text{co}(\mathbf{M})$, and increase continuously each x_i at a rate of w_i , until some constraint $\sum_{i \in \Lambda} x_i \leq M_\Lambda$ is saturated.

Proposition B.2. *Given $x \in \text{co}(\mathbf{M})$ and a vector of weights $w \in \mathbb{R}_+^k$, we define*

$$c^* = \max\{c \geq 0 \mid x + c \cdot w \in \text{co}(\mathbf{M})\} = \max\left\{c \geq 0 \mid \forall \Lambda \subset [K], \sum_{i \in \Lambda} (x_i + c \cdot w_i) \leq M_\Lambda\right\}.$$

Then, c^ is equal to the optimal solution of the following linear program.*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{maximize} && c \\
&\mathbf{such\ that} && c \geq 0 \\
&&& 0 \leq \mu_{u,v} \leq \mathbb{1}_{\{(u,v) \in E\}} && (\forall u \in U, v \in V) \\
&&& \sum_{u \in U} \mu_{u,v} \leq 1 && (\forall v \in V) \\
&&& \sum_{v \in V} \mu_{u,v} \leq 1 && (\forall u \in U) \\
&&& x_i + c \cdot w_i = \sum_{v \in V_i} \sum_{u \in U} \mu_{u,v} && (\forall i \in [K])
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Given a feasible solution c to the linear program, the variables $\mu_{u,v}$ provide a fractional matching proving that $x + c \cdot w \in \text{co}(\mathbf{M})$. Conversely, the optimal c^* has a corresponding fractional matching, which yields a feasible solution to the linear program. ■

Finally, when increasing each coordinate x_i at a rate of w_i , we sometimes need to compute the sets $\Lambda \subseteq [K]$ for which the constraint $\sum_{i \in \Lambda} (x_i + c \cdot w_i) \leq M_\Lambda$ is saturated (holds with equality). Importantly, using [BCT85, Lemma 2.2] the set of Λ 's for which the constraint is tight is closed under union and intersection. That implies that there exists a maximal (inclusion-wise) set Λ^* which saturates the constraint.

To compute Λ^* , we start by computing the optimal solution to the dual linear of Proposition B.2. Each constraint $x_i + c \cdot w_i \leq \sum_{v \in V_i} \sum_{u \in U} \mu_{u,v}$ has a dual variable which, by complementary slackness, will be positive only if the constraint is tight. Finally, we define Λ^* as the set of groups for which the dual variable is positive. By construction, we have that $\sum_{i \in \Lambda^*} x_i = M_{\Lambda^*}$.

C Omitted proofs

In this section, we present the omitted proofs of the article.

C.1 Proof of Proposition 3.4

Without loss of generality take $\sigma = I_K$ the identity permutation and $x = P_\sigma$. To prove property (1) it is enough to show that for any $i \in [K]$, $x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_i = M_{[i]}$. Take $i \in [K]$, define $y = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i, 0, \dots, 0)$, and $z = (z_1, \dots, z_i, 0, \dots, 0)$ such that $\|z\|_1 = M_{[i]}$. By definition of $M_{[i]}$, it holds $\|y\|_1 \leq \|z\|_1$. If the inequality is strict, the augmentation property of Theorem 3.1 contradicts the lexicographic optimality of x , hence proves point (1). To prove (2), take $y \in \mathbf{M}$, $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_K \geq \lambda_{K+1} = 0$, and write

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 x_1 + \dots + \lambda_i x_K &= (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)x_1 + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)(x_1 + x_2) + \dots + (\lambda_K - \lambda_{K+1})(x_1 + \dots + x_K) \\ &\geq (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)y_1 + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)(y_1 + y_2) + \dots + (\lambda_K - \lambda_{K+1})(y_1 + \dots + y_K) \\ &= \lambda_1 y_1 + \dots + \lambda_K y_K, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is a (positive) linear combination of inequalities from property (1).

C.2 Proof of Proposition 4.3

For convenience, define $x = P_{\text{leximin}}$. To prove (1), assume for the sake of contradiction that there exists $t \geq 0$ and $y \in \mathbf{M}$ such that $\sum_{i \in [K]} \min(t, x_i) < \sum_{i \in [K]} \min(t, y_i)$. We define two points $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \in \mathbf{M}$, where $\tilde{x}_i = \min(t, x_i)$ and $\tilde{y}_i = \min(t, y_i)$, and we get $\|\tilde{x}\|_1 < \|\tilde{y}\|_1$. Using the augmentation property of Proposition 3.6, there exists $i \in [K]$ such that $\tilde{x}_i < \tilde{y}_i$ and $\tilde{x} + \varepsilon e_i \in \mathbf{M}$. Finally, observe that $x <_{\min} \tilde{x} + \varepsilon e_i$ which contradicts the leximin optimality of x .

To prove (2), we proceed by induction. The property holds at $j = 1$ by definition of P_{leximin} . Assume the property holds at $j - 1$. For the sake of contradiction, assume that there exists $y \in \mathbf{M}$ such that $\sum_{i \in [j]} x_{(i)} < \sum_{i \in [j]} y_{(i)}$. Then, we have $x_{(i)} < y_{(i)}$. Setting $t = y_{(i)}$, observe that

$$\sum_{j=1}^K \min(t, x_j) \leq \sum_{j=1}^i x_{(j)} + (K - i + 1) \cdot t < \sum_{j=1}^i y_{(j)} + (K - i + 1) \cdot t = \sum_{j=1}^K \min(t, y_j).$$

This contradicts (1), which concludes the induction proof of (2). To prove (3), take $y \in \mathbf{M}$, $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_K \geq \lambda_{K+1} = 0$, and write

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 x_{(1)} + \dots + \lambda_K x_{(K)} &= (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)x_{(1)} + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)(x_{(1)} + x_{(2)}) + \dots + (\lambda_K - \lambda_{K+1})(x_{(1)} + \dots + x_{(K)}) \\ &\geq (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)y_{(1)} + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)(y_{(1)} + y_{(2)}) + \dots + (\lambda_K - \lambda_{K+1})(y_{(1)} + \dots + y_{(K)}) \\ &= \lambda_1 y_{(1)} + \dots + \lambda_K y_{(K)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is a (positive) linear combination of inequalities from property (2).

C.3 Proof of Proposition 4.4

Let $z \in P$. Because P corresponds also to the set of maximum matchings, we have that $\|z\|_1$ is equal for all points in P , in particular $\|x\|_1 = \|z\|_1$. Using Proposition 4.3, we know that for all $j \in [K]$, $\sum_{i \in [j]} x_{(i)} \geq \sum_{i \in [j]} z_{(i)}$. Using additionally that both points z and x sum to the same quantity, this implies that for every $j \in [K]$, $\sum_{i=j}^K x_{(i)} \leq \sum_{i \in [j]} z_{(i)}$. The previous inequalities taken with $\|z\|_1 = \|x\|_1$ means that x is majorized by any point $z \in P$. Therefore by Karamata's inequality, because $x \mapsto x^p$ is strictly convex for $p > 1$, x is the unique minimizer in P of the function $\sum_{i \in K} z_i^p$, which is simply $\|z\|_p^p$.

To see that x also uniquely minimize the variance, it is enough to remark that for any $z \in P$, $\mathbf{Var}(z) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i \in [K]} (z_i - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{l \in [K]} z_l)^2 = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i \in [K]} (z_i - \|x\|_1)^2 = \frac{1}{K} \|z\|_2^2 + (1 - 2/K) \|x\|_1^2$, which only depend on z through $\|z\|_2^2$, which is uniquely minimized by the leximin optimal x .

C.4 Proof of Proposition 4.5

Let $h = \frac{M_{[K]}}{K} \mathbf{1} \in F_1$. For any $w \in \mathbf{P}$ and $z = t\mathbf{1} \in F_1$, observe that

$$\|w - z\|_2^2 = \|(w - h) - (h - z)\|_2^2 = \|w - h\|_2^2 + \|h - z\|_2^2 + 2\langle w - h | h - z \rangle$$

Because F_1 and \mathbf{P} are orthogonal, the scalar product is equal to zero:

$$\langle w - h | h - z \rangle = \sum_{i \in K} (w_i - \frac{M_{[K]}}{K}) (\frac{M_{[K]}}{K} - t) = (\|w\|_1 - M_{[K]}) (\frac{M_{[K]}}{K} - t) = 0.$$

Using the fact that $\|w\|_2^2 = \|w - h\|_2^2 + \|h\|_2^2$, we have that $\|w - z\|_2^2 = \|w - h\|_2^2 + \|h - z\|_2^2 = \|w\|_2^2 - \|h\|_2^2 + \|h - z\|_2^2$. Therefore, when projecting z onto \mathbf{P} , we have that $\|w - z\|_2$ is minimized when $\|w\|_2$ is maximized, that is when $w = x$ using Proposition 4.4. When projecting w onto $F_1 \cap \text{co}(\mathbf{M})$, we have that $\|w - z\|_2$ is minimized when $\|h - z\|_2$ is minimized, that is when $t = t^*$ because $t^* \leq M_{[K]}/K$.

C.5 Proof of Proposition 5.3

We prove the desired equality by proving both inequalities. Let $x^* \in \text{co}(\mathbf{P})$ and $y^* \in \mathbf{H}$. By reverse triangle inequality it follows,

$$\max_{x \in \text{co}(\mathbf{M})} \|x\|_1 - \max_{y \in \mathbf{H}} \|y\|_1 = \|x^*\|_1 - \max_{y \in \mathbf{H}} \|y\|_1 \leq \|x^*\|_1 - \|y^*\|_1 \leq \|x^* - y^*\|_1.$$

Since the left-hand side does not depend on the points x^* and y^* chosen, taking infimum on both sides we obtain the first of the two inequalities. Conversely, let $y^* \in \mathbf{H}$ so that $\|y^*\|_1 = \max_{y \in \mathbf{H}} \|y\|_1$ and $x^* \in \text{co}(\mathbf{P})$ satisfying that $x_i^* \geq y_i^*$ for all $i \in [K]$. Then,

$$\|x^* - y^*\|_1 = \sum_{i \in [K]} |x_i^* - y_i^*| = \sum_{i \in [K]} x_i^* - y_i^* = \|x^*\|_1 - \|y^*\|_1 = \max_{x \in \text{co}(\mathbf{M})} \|x\|_1 - \max_{y \in \mathbf{H}} \|y\|_1,$$

from where the second inequality follows by taking infimum. Finally, the existence of a point $(x, y) \in \text{co}(\mathbf{P}) \times \mathbf{H}$ attaining the infimum is due to $\text{co}(\mathbf{P})$ and \mathbf{H} being compact sets on \mathbb{R}^K and $\|\cdot\|_1$ being a continuous function. Indeed, notice that both sets are bounded as they are subsets of \mathbf{M} (which is bounded as well as G is a finite graph), $\text{co}(\mathbf{P})$ is the closed convex hull of \mathbf{P} , and \mathbf{H} is closed by assumption.

C.6 Proof of Proposition 6.5

Let c^* be the solution to Equation (1) and Λ^* the corresponding set of groups. Without loss of generality, let us take $\Lambda = [\ell]$, for $\ell \leq K$, and denote $\bar{M} := \max_{i \in [K]} M_i$, $\bar{m} := \min_{i \in [K]} M_i$, $\hat{m} = \bar{M}/\bar{m}$. It follows,

$$\text{PoF}_O = \frac{M_{[K]}}{M_{[\ell]}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{i \in [\ell]} M_i}{\sum_{i \in [K]} M_i} = \left(1 + \frac{M_{1 \dots \ell+1} + \dots + M_{1 \dots K}}{M_{[\ell]}}\right) \cdot \frac{\sum_{i \in [\ell]} M_i}{\sum_{i \in [K]} M_i} \leq (1 + (K - \ell)\hat{m}) \frac{\ell}{K} \hat{m}.$$




Figure 11: Tight bound example for $M = 3$, $K = 4$, and white squares as jobs

Since ℓ is integral, the function $\ell \mapsto (1 + (K - \ell)\hat{m})\frac{\ell}{K}\hat{m}$ reaches its maximum at $\ell^* = \frac{K}{2} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{K\text{odd}}}{2\hat{m}}$. Plugging this in the previous bound, we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PoF}_O &\leq \left(1 + \left(\frac{K}{2} - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{K\text{odd}}}{2\hat{m}}\right)\hat{m}\right) \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{K\text{odd}}}{2K\hat{m}}\right)\hat{m} = \left(1 + \frac{K\hat{m}}{2} - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{K\text{odd}}}{2}\right) \left(\frac{\hat{m}}{2} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{K\text{odd}}}{2K}\right) \\ &= \frac{\hat{m}}{2} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{K\text{odd}}}{2K} + \frac{K\hat{m}^2}{4} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{K\text{odd}}\hat{m}}{4} - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{K\text{odd}}\hat{m}}{4} - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{K\text{odd}}}{4K} = \frac{\hat{m}}{2} + \frac{K\hat{m}^2}{4} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{K\text{odd}}}{4K}, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof of the upper bound.

Now let us look at a tight counter-example. Suppose that $M_i = M, \forall i \in [K]$, for $M \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider a graph with M jobs connected to $M\lceil\frac{K}{2}\rceil$ agents divided into $\lceil\frac{K}{2}\rceil$ groups $V_1, \dots, V_{\lceil\frac{K}{2}\rceil}$, each group with M agents, forming a complete subgraph. In addition, consider $\lfloor\frac{K}{2}\rfloor$ subgraphs, each of them composed of M jobs connected to M agents, each subgraph corresponding to a different group $V_{\lceil\frac{K}{2}\rceil+1}, \dots, V_K$. Figure 11 illustrates such a graph. An opportunity fair matching can match at most $M/\lceil\frac{K}{2}\rceil$ agents of each group due to the competition among the first $\lceil\frac{K}{2}\rceil$ groups. It follows

$$\max_{x \in \mathbf{F}_O} \|x\|_1 = \frac{KM}{\lceil\frac{K}{2}\rceil} \text{ while } \max_{x \in \mathbf{M}} \|x\|_1 = M + M\lfloor\frac{K}{2}\rfloor \implies \text{PoF}_O = \frac{(1 + \lfloor\frac{K}{2}\rfloor)\lceil\frac{K}{2}\rceil}{K},$$

which is exactly $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{K}{4} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{K\text{odd}}}{4K}$.

C.7 Proof of Proposition 6.6

The first part of the proposition is immediate. Suppose $\text{PoF}_O > 1$ then, as for the proof of Theorem 6.3, the point $(M_1, \dots, M_K)/(K-1)$ is feasible, yielding $\text{PoF}_O \leq \rho(K-1) \leq 1$ as $\rho \in [1/K, 1/(K-1)]$, which is a contradiction.

Suppose next that $\rho \in [1/(K-1), 1]$ and denote $\Delta := \sum_{i \in [K]} M_i - M_{[K]}$ the additive difference between the Utopian matching and the optimum one. By assumption we get $\Delta = (1 - \rho)KM$.

Now let us compute c^* . Without loss of generality (the same argument apply to other permutations) we consider the sequence of groups $([t])_{t \in [K-1]}$, and define, for $t \in [K-1]$,

$$c(t) = \frac{\sum_{i \in [t]} (M_{[i]} - M_{[i-1]})}{\sum_{i \in [t]} M_i},$$

with $M_0 = 0$. Finally, denote by $\delta_i = M_i - (M_{[i]} - M_{[i-1]})$, for $i \in [K]$. In particular, $\delta_1 = 0$. For $t \in [K-1]$, it follows,

$$c(t) = \frac{\sum_{i \in [t]} M_{[i]} - M_{[i-1]}}{\sum_{i \in [t]} M_i} = \frac{\sum_{i \in [t]} M_i - M_i + M_{[i]} - M_{[i-1]}}{\sum_{i \in [t]} M_i} = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i \in [t]} \delta_i}{\sum_{i \in [t]} M_i}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 1 - \frac{\Delta}{\sum_{i \in [t]} M_i} + \frac{\sum_{i=t+1}^K \delta_i}{\sum_{i \in [t]} M_i} = 1 - (1 - \rho) \frac{K}{t} + \frac{\sum_{i=t+1}^K \delta_i}{tM} \\
&\geq 1 - (1 - \rho) \frac{K}{t} + \max\left(0, \frac{(1 - \rho)K - (t - 1)}{t}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\sum_{i=t+1}^K \delta_i = \Delta - \sum_{i=2}^t \delta_i = (1 - \rho)KM - (t - 1)M$. The maximum being greater than 0 is equivalent to $t \leq (1 - \rho)K + 1$. As t is an integer, it holds that for all $t \leq \lfloor (1 - \rho)K + 1 \rfloor$, $c(t) \geq 1/t$. This function being decreasing, its value is always greater than $1/\lfloor (1 - \rho)K + 1 \rfloor$. Otherwise if $t \leq \lceil (1 - \rho)K + 1 \rceil$, the maximum is equal to 0, and $c(t) \geq 1 - (1 - \rho)K/t$, which is increasing in t , thus $c(t) \geq 1 - (1 - \rho)K/(\lceil (1 - \rho)K + 1 \rceil)$. This is valid for all permutations of increasing group sets. Note that the relaxed bound can simply be obtained at this point by making t go to exactly $(1 - \rho)K + 1$ in both cases. Overall, we obtain that $c^* \geq \min(1 - (1 - \rho)K/(\lceil (1 - \rho)K + 1 \rceil), 1/\lfloor (1 - \rho)K + 1 \rfloor)$. Simplifying this expression as $\lceil (1 - \rho)K + 1 \rceil = K + \lceil -K\rho \rceil + 1 = K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor + 1$ and $\lfloor (1 - \rho)K + 1 \rfloor = K + \lfloor -K\rho \rfloor + 1 = K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor$, we get,

$$\text{PoF}_O = \frac{\rho KM}{c^* KM} \leq \rho \max\left(\frac{K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor + 1}{K\rho - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor + 1}, K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor\right) \leq \rho((1 - \rho)K + 1).$$

To end the proof, we provide an example to show the tightness of the bound, which is a continuous parametrization of the one in Appendix C.6. Consider a graph with $\lfloor K\rho \rfloor - 1$ independent groups and that can match M agents each, one partially independent group which can match $(K\rho - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor)M$ nodes independently, and the rest of the K groups which must share M jobs between them and with $(1 - \alpha)M$ agents of the partially independent group. It holds $M_i = M$ for all $i \in [K]$ and $M_{\lfloor K \rfloor} = (\lfloor K\rho \rfloor + \alpha)M = \rho KM$.

Let us compute the value of the fair optimum. There are two distinct cases.

1. $K\rho - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor \geq 1/(K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor)$: The best identical fraction of the entitlement that the $K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor$ competing groups (without the partially independent group) can get is $1/(K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor)$, which is smaller than the number of matched agents that the partially independent group can get alone. Hence, it is sub-optimal to share jobs with this group, implying that the fair optimum value is equal to $KM/(K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor)$. In particular, we get $\text{PoF}_O = \rho(K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor)$. We claim that the maximum in the upper bound is indeed this quantity. By assumption it holds $(K\rho - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor + 1) \geq (K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor + 1)/(K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor)$ which implies that

$$\frac{K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor + 1}{K\rho - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor + 1} \leq K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor,$$

concluding this first case.

2. $K\rho - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor \leq 1/(K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor)$: In this case, some jobs need to be shared with the partially independent group. Let f_c and f_p be the optimal fraction that should be given to a competing group and to the partially independent group, respectively. We obtain the system of equations,

$$\left. \begin{aligned} (K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor)f_c + f_p &= 1, \\ f_p + K\rho - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor &= f_c. \end{aligned} \right\} \implies (K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor + 1)f_c = K\rho - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor + 1,$$

This results in $\text{PoF}_O = \rho(K - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor + 1)/(K\rho - \lfloor K\rho \rfloor + 1)$. As done for the first case, we can show using that the maximum in the upper bound is equal to this quantity.

C.8 Proof of Proposition 6.7

Let c^* be the optimal value of Equation (1) and Λ^* be the subset that attains the minimum. We claim that M^σ being decreasing for every σ implies that $\Lambda^* = [K]$ and thus, $\text{PoF}_O = 1$. Consider $\sigma = I_K$ the identity permutation (for the rest of permutations the argument is the same one), $x = P_\sigma$, and denote $B_i := \frac{M_{[i]}}{\sum_{j \in [i]} M_j}$. It follows,

$$B_{i+1} - B_i = \frac{M_{[i+1]}}{\sum_{j \in [i+1]} M_j} - \frac{M_{[i]}}{\sum_{j \in [i]} M_j} = \frac{\sum_{j \in [i]} (x_{i+1} M_j - M_{(i+1)} x_j)}{(\sum_{j \in [i+1]} M_j)(\sum_{j \in [i]} M_j)}.$$

Since M^σ is decreasing, for any $j < i + 1$,

$$\frac{x_j}{M_j} \geq \frac{x_{i+1}}{M_{i+1}} \iff M_{i+1} x_j \geq x_{i+1} M_j \implies B_i \geq B_{i+1},$$

where the last implication comes from the fact that $B_{i+1} - B_i$ is the sum of only negative values. Therefore, when computing $\min_{i \in [K]} \frac{M_{[i]}}{\sum_{j \in [i]} M_j}$ the minimum is attained by $[K]$. For the rest of permutation the arguments are the same ones. We conclude that $\Lambda^* = [K]$.

C.9 Proof of Proposition 6.8

Consider $\sigma = I_K$ the identity permutation and $x = P_\sigma$. For any other permutation the analysis is analogous. We prove that M^σ as defined in Proposition 6.7 is decreasing by running Algorithm 1. Let x_1 be the maximum number of V_1 agents that can be matched. Match all of them and take out of the graph all the matched vertices. The resulting graph is still complete and contains $K - 1$ groups. Let x_2 be the maximum number of V_2 agents that can be matched in the subgraph. Because the graph is complete there are three options:

1. $x_2 = M_2$ in which case all V_2 agents can be matched. Match them all, take all the matched vertices out of the graph, and repeat the procedure with V_3 .
2. $x_2 = 0$ in which case the subgraph has $U = \emptyset$ and then $x_i = 0$ for all $i \in \{2, \dots, K\}$.
3. $M_2 > x_2 > 0$. Match the x_2 possible agents and take out of the graph all matched vertices. At the following step, the only possible case is case 2.

In any case, the sequence M^σ corresponds to a sequence of only ones (every time case 1 holds), eventually an intermediary case where $x_i \in (0, 1)$ (when case 3 holds), and then all posterior entries are zero (only case 2 holds). The sequence M^σ is therefore, decreasing. We conclude using Proposition 6.7.

C.10 Proof of Proposition 6.9

We will use the following Theorem:

Theorem (Theorem 2.2 [FK16]). *For any Erdős-Rényi random graph with $p \leq \frac{1}{\omega n^{3/2}}$, where $\omega = \omega(n) \rightarrow \infty$ arbitrarily slow as $n \rightarrow \infty$, \mathbb{G} is a collection of edges and vertices with high probability.*

Denote $p_0 := \max_{i \in [K]} p_i$ and consider the non-bipartite random graph \mathbb{G}^0 as the graph obtained with vertex set $U \cup V$ and edge probability p_0 . By the Theorem recalled in Appendix Appendix C.10, \mathbb{G}^0 is a collection of edges and vertices with high probability. The random bipartite graph \mathbb{G} is

stochastic dominated ⁴ by \mathbb{G}^0 so, in particular, with high probability, it also corresponds to a collection of isolated vertices and simple edges. It follows that for any $i \in [K]$, $M_{[i]} = M_i$, which implies that for any σ , the sequence M^σ as defined in Proposition 6.7, is constant equal to 1. We conclude that $\text{PoF}_O(\mathbb{G}) = 1$.

C.11 Proof of Proposition 6.10

We will use the following Theorem:

Theorem (Theorem 6.1 [FK16]). *Let $p = \frac{\log(n)+\omega}{n}$ with $\omega = \omega(n) \rightarrow \infty$ arbitrarily slow as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{G} \text{ has a perfect matching}) = 1$.*

We first show that $|V_i|$ concentrates. The random variable $|V_i| \sim \text{Bin}(\beta n, \alpha_i)$ corresponds to a binomial random variable of parameters βn and α_i . In particular, $\mathbb{E}[|V_i|] = \alpha_i \beta n$. By Hoeffding's inequality, as $|V_i|$ can be written as the sum of i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|V_i| - \alpha_i \beta n > \sqrt{n \log(n)}\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-2 \frac{(\sqrt{n \log(n)})^2}{n}\right) = \frac{2}{n^2} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Regarding M_i , consider the bipartite subgraph containing only the agents in V_i and U . Since $p_i \geq \log^2(n)/n$, Appendix C.11 implies there exists a matching of size $\min(|V_i|, n) = \min(\alpha_i \beta n, n)$ and, therefore, $M_i = \min(\alpha_i \beta n, n)$. Finally, consider $\sigma \in \Sigma([K])$, match the first $M_{\sigma(1)}$ agents, and remove all matched vertices from \mathbb{G} , leaving the set U with $[n(1 - \alpha_i \beta)]_+$ nodes. Consider the second group $\sigma(2)$. Because $p_{\sigma(2)} \geq \log^2(n)/n$, from Appendix C.11, $M_{\sigma(2)} = \min(|V_{\sigma(2)}|, [n(1 - \alpha_i \beta)]_+)$. In other words, either $V_{\sigma(2)}$ is totally matched and we move to study the group $\sigma(3)$, it is partially matched and so no agent in $V_{\sigma(3)}$ to $V_{\sigma(K)}$ can be matched, or no agent in $V_{\sigma(2)}$ is matched. In any case, the sequence M^σ consists on a sequence of ones, eventually a value in $(0, 1)$, and then a sequence of zeros. We conclude by Proposition 6.7.

⁴Stochastic dominance can be proved by using a coupling technique. For more details, please check Lemma 1.1 [FK16].