

# Conflict and Fairness in Resource Allocation

**Susobhan Bandopadhyay** ✉

National Institute of Science, Education and Research, An OCC of Homi Bhabha National Institute, Bhubaneswar 752050, Odisha, India.

**Aritra Banik** ✉

National Institute of Science, Education and Research, An OCC of Homi Bhabha National Institute, Bhubaneswar 752050, Odisha, India.

**Sushmita Gupta** ✉

The Institute of Mathematical Sciences, HBNI, Chennai, India

**Pallavi Jain** ✉

Indian Institute of Technology Jodhpur, India

**Abhishek Sahu** ✉

National Institute of Science, Education and Research, An OCC of Homi Bhabha National Institute, Bhubaneswar 752050, Odisha, India.

**Saket Saurabh** ✉

The Institute of Mathematical Sciences, HBNI, Chennai, India

**Prafullkumar Tale** ✉ 🏠

Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Bhopal, Bhopal, India

---

## Abstract

In the standard model of fair allocation of resources to agents, every agent has some utility for every resource, and the goal is to assign resources to agents so that the agents' welfare is maximized. Motivated by job scheduling, interest in this problem dates back to the work of Deumer et al. [SIAM J. on Algebraic Discrete Methods'82]. Recent works consider the compatibility between resources and assign only mutually compatible resources to an agent. We study a fair allocation problem in which we are given a set of agents, a set of resources, a utility function for every agent over a set of resources, and a *conflict graph* on the set of resources (where an edge denotes incompatibility). The goal is to assign resources to the agents such that (i) the set of resources allocated to an agent are compatible with each other, and (ii) the minimum satisfaction of an agent is maximized, where the satisfaction of an agent is the sum of the utility of the assigned resources. Chiarelli et al. [Algorithmica'22] explore this problem from the classical complexity perspective to draw the boundary between the cases that are polynomial-time solvable and those that are NP-hard. In this article, we study the parameterized complexity of the problem (and its variants) by considering several natural and structural parameters.

**2012 ACM Subject Classification** Theory of computation → Fixed parameter tractability

**Keywords and phrases** Fair Allocation, Conflict-free, Parameterized Complexity

**Related Version** An earlier version of the paper [19], with a subset of authors, contains some of the results mentioned in this article.

## 1 Introduction

Resource allocation is a central topic in economics and computation. It is an umbrella term that captures a plethora of well-known problem settings where resources are matched to agents in a meaningful way that respects the preferences/choices of agents, and when relevant, resources as well. Stable matching, generalized assignment, and fair division are well-known problems that fall under the purview of resource allocation. These topics are extensively studied in economics, (computational) social choice theory, game theory, and


computer science, to name a few, and are incredibly versatile and adaptable to a wide variety of terminology, techniques and traditions.

A well-known framework within which resource allocation is studied is the world of JOB SCHEDULING problems on non-identical machines. In this scenario, the machines are acting as agents, and the jobs are the tasks such that specific jobs are better suited for a given machine than others and this variation is captured by the “satisfaction level” of the machine towards the assigned jobs. Moreover, the jobs have specific time intervals within which they have to be performed, and only one job can be scheduled on a machine at a time. Thus, the subset of jobs assigned to a single machine must respect these constraints, and the objective can be both maximization and minimization, as well as to simply test feasibility. Results on the computational aspect of resource allocation that incorporates interactions and dependencies between the resources are relatively few. A rather inexhaustive but representative list of papers that take a combinatorial approach in analyzing a resource allocation problem and are aligned with our work in this paper is [6, 4, 24, 14, 3, 1, 7, 28, 29, 21, 5].

The starting point of our research is the decades-old work of Deurmeyer et al. [13] that studies a variant of JOB SCHEDULING in which the goal is to assign a set of independent jobs to identical machines to maximize the minimal completion time of the jobs. Their NP-hardness result for two machines (i.e., two agents in our setting) is an early work with a similar flavor. The more recent work of Chiarelli et. al. [7] that studies “fair allocation” of indivisible items into pairwise disjoint conflict-free subsets that maximizes the minimum satisfaction of the agents is the work closest to ours. They, too, consider various graphs, called the *conflict graph*, that capture the conflict/compatibilities between various items and explore the classical complexity boundary between strong NP-hardness and pseudo-polynomial tractability for a constant number of agents. Our analysis probes beyond the NP-hardness of these problems and explores this world from the lens of *parameterized complexity*, which gives a more refined tractability landscape for NP-hard problems.

The parameterized complexity paradigm allows for a more refined analysis of the problem’s complexity. In this setting, we associate each instance  $I$  with parameters  $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots$ , and are interested in an algorithm with a running time  $f(\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots) \cdot |I|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$  for some computable function  $f$ . When these parameters are significantly smaller than the total size of the input, we get a much faster algorithm than the brute-force algorithm that is expected to run in time exponential in the input size for NP-hard problems. Parameterized problems that admit such an algorithm are called *fixed-parameter tractable* (FPT) with respect to the parameters under consideration. On the other hand, parameterized problems that are hard for the complexity class  $W[r]$  for any  $r \geq 1$  do not admit fixed-parameter algorithms with respect to that parameter, under a standard complexity assumption. If for a particular choice of parameter  $\ell$ , the problem remains NP-hard even when  $\ell$  is a constant then, we say the problem is *para-NP-hard* when parameterized by  $\ell$ . A parameter may originate from the formulation of the problem itself, and is called a *natural parameter*, or it can be a property of the conflict graph, and is called a *structural parameter*.

Next, we define our problem and discuss the parameters of interest. The problem can be viewed as a two-sided matching between a set of agents and a set of jobs. Each worker (i.e., an *agent*) has a utility function defined over the set of *jobs*. Their satisfaction for a *bundle*—a subset of jobs that induces an independent set in  $\mathcal{H}$ —of jobs is the sum of the agents’ utilities for each job in the bundle. The incompatibilities among the jobs are captured by a graph  $\mathcal{H}$  defined on the set of jobs such that an edge represents *conflict* (incompatibility, in other words). The overall objective is to assign pairwise-disjoint bundles to agents such that the minimum satisfaction of the agents is maximized. A decision version of the above problem



■ **Figure 1** Bird's-eye view of the results in the article. An arrow from parameter  $\ell_1$  to  $\ell_2$  implies that  $\ell_2$  is upper bounded by some computable function of  $\ell_1$ . The red-colored rectangles denote that the problem is NP-hard even when the parameter is a constant. The green-colored rectangles denote that there is an FPT algorithm. Note that some of these results are conditional or restrictive. Please refer to the theorems for precise statements.

can be defined as follows:

**CONFLICT FREE FAIR ALLOCATION (CFFA)**

**Input:** A set of  $m$  jobs  $\mathcal{I}$  and a conflict graph  $\mathcal{H}$  with vertex set  $\mathcal{I}$ , a positive integer  $\eta$  called target value, a set of  $n$  agents  $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$  and for every agent  $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ , a utility function  $\text{ut}_i: \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ .

**Question:** Does there exist a function  $\phi: \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  such that for every  $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\phi^{-1}(a_i)$  is an independent set in  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\sum_{x \in \phi^{-1}(a_i)} \text{ut}_i(x) \geq \eta$ ?

We consider the following three variations of the problem viz COMPLETE, PARTIAL, and SIZE-BOUNDED. In the first version, we are required to assign every job to some agent, i.e., the domain of the function  $\phi$  is  $\mathcal{I}$ . The second version relaxes this criterion and allows  $\phi$  to be a *partial function* on  $\mathcal{I}$ , i.e, each of the jobs need not be assigned to an agent. In the third version, an input contains an additional integer  $s$  that restricts the number of jobs that can be assigned to any agent, i.e., we have a further requirement of  $|\phi^{-1}(a)| \leq s$ , where  $\phi$  may be a partial or complete function. From now onwards, we will use C-CFFA for the complete version, P-CFFA for the partial version, SB-C-CFFA for the size-bounded complete version, and SB-P-CFFA for the size-bounded partial versions.

The natural parameters, in this case, are the number of jobs  $m$ , the number of agents  $n$ , the threshold value  $\eta$ , and the size bound on the bundle  $s$ . For any non-trivial instance of any version, we have  $n \leq m$ . Otherwise, there will be an agent who does not receive any job and hence the target value cannot be attained. Moreover, we have  $s \leq m$  for the size bounded variants. Moreover, it is safe to assume that the range of  $\text{ut}_i(x)$  is  $\{0, 1, \dots, \eta\}$ , for all  $i \in [n]$ . Note that  $\eta$  need not be bounded above by a function of  $m$ . If this is true, we say  $\eta$  is *large*. For a class of graphs  $\mathcal{G}$ , we define  $\pi: \mathcal{G} \mapsto \mathbb{N}$ , where  $\pi(\mathcal{H})$  denotes some structural properties associated with graph  $\mathcal{H}$  in  $\mathcal{G}$ . For most of the reasonable structural parameters, it is safe to assume that  $\pi(\mathcal{H}) \leq |V(\mathcal{H})| = m$ . We set  $t = \binom{m}{2} - |E(\mathcal{H})|$ , the number of missing edges in  $\mathcal{H}$ . See Figure 1 for the relations amongst the parameters considered in this article.

We start our technical discussion by presenting two results that show that the problems are hard even for very restricted cases.

► **Theorem 1.** *We prove that*

## 1. C-CFFA

- a. admits a polynomial time algorithm if  $n = 1$  even if  $\eta$  is large; and
  - b. is NP-hard for (i) any  $n \geq 2$  even if the binary encoding  $\eta$  is a polynomial function of  $m$ ; as well as (ii) any  $n \geq 3$  even if  $\eta = 1$ .
2. P-CFFA is NP-hard for any  $n \geq 1$  even if  $\eta$  is at most  $m$  (and range of  $ut$  is  $\{1\}$ ).
3. Both SB-C-CFFA and SB-P-CFFA

- a. admit polynomial-time algorithms when (i) both  $n$  and  $s$  are constants (even if  $\eta$  is large), or (ii)  $s = 1$  (even if  $\eta$  is large), and
- b. are NP-hard (i) for any  $n \geq 1$  even if the binary encoding of  $\eta$  is a polynomial function of  $m$ , or (ii) for any  $\eta \geq 2$  and any  $s \geq 2$ .

Theorem 1 rules out the possibility of an FPT algorithm when the parameter under consideration is one of the following: the number of agents  $n$ , the maximum size of a bundle  $s$ , the threshold value  $\eta$ , or a structural parameters  $\pi(\mathcal{H})$ , where  $\pi(\mathcal{H})$  is a constant when  $\mathcal{H}$  is an edgeless graph. This result, however, does not rule out an FPT algorithm when parameterized by the number of items,  $m$ . Indeed, note that a simple brute-force algorithm that enumerates all possible  $(n + 1)^m$  ways of assigning the jobs to the agents, where each job has  $(n + 1)$  choices of agents to choose from ( $+1$  is required in partial allocation if a job is unassigned) runs in time  $(n + 1)^m \cdot (m + \log(\eta))^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ . As  $n \leq m$ , this is an FPT algorithm parameterized by  $m$ . Our following result significantly improves the running time.

► **Theorem 2.** *All four variants of CFFA admit an algorithm running in time  $2^m \cdot (m + \log(\eta))^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ . Moreover, unless the ETH fails, none of the variations admits an algorithm running in time  $2^{\mathcal{O}(m)} \cdot (m + \log(\eta))^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ .*

In the following results, we consider a combination of other parameters mentioned above to obtain some tractable results. We start with the combined parameter  $n + s$ . Note that for the complete version,  $m \leq ns$ , otherwise, it is a trivial no-instance. Thus, Theorem 2 implies an FPT algorithm with respect to  $n + s$  for the complete version. Consequently, for this parameter, we only focus on the partial variants. Note that an FPT algorithm for SB-P-CFFA would imply an FPT algorithm for P-CFFA, because  $s \leq m$  and an algorithm that makes subroutine calls to an  $\text{FPT}(n + s)$  algorithm for SB-P-CFFA for increasing values of  $s$  (from 1 to  $m$ ) is an  $\text{FPT}(n + s)$  algorithm for P-CFFA. Hence, we focus on designing an algorithm for SB-P-CFFA. However, hoping that P-CFFA is FPT parameterized by  $n + s$  in general graphs is futile because the problem generalizes the MAXIMUM WEIGHT INDEPENDENT SET problem, which we formally establish in the proof of Theorem 1(Item 2). Hence, we can only expect to obtain an  $\text{FPT}(n + s)$  algorithm for special classes of graphs. Consequently, our exploration moves towards identifying graph classes that may admit such an algorithm. Towards this, we introduce the following problem, which we believe could be of independent interest. Note that here, the size of the solution (i.e. independent set) is upper bound by the parameter, distinguishing it from the classic MAXIMUM WEIGHT INDEPENDENT SET problem.

SIZE BOUNDED MAX WEIGHT INDEPENDENT SET (SB-MWIS)

**Input:** A graph  $G$ , positive integers  $k$  and  $\rho$ , a weight function  $w : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ .

**Question:** Does there exist an independent set  $S$  of size at most  $k$  such that  $\sum_{v \in S} w(v) \geq \rho$ ?

SB-MWIS is a clear generalization of the INDEPENDENT SET problem (by setting  $\rho = k$  and unit weight function), a very well studied problem in the realm of parameterized

complexity and indeed in the wider field of graph algorithms. This connection allows us to demarcate the tractability border of our problem SB-CFFA via the computational landscape of INDEPENDENT SET. In the field of parameterized complexity, INDEPENDENT SET has been extensively studied on families of graphs that satisfy some structural properties. We take the same exploration path for our problem SB-P-CFFA. The graph classes in which INDEPENDENT SET has an FPT( $k$ ) algorithm is a potential field for FPT algorithms for SB-P-CFFA. This possibility has to be formally explored.

Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a family of *hereditary* graphs. That is, if  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ , then all the induced subgraphs of  $G$  belong to  $\mathcal{G}$ . In other words,  $\mathcal{G}$  is closed under taking induced subgraphs.

For a hereditary family  $\mathcal{G}$ ,  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS denotes the restriction of SB-MWIS where the input graph  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA denote the restriction of SB-P-CFFA where the conflict graph  $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}$ .

The following result completely characterizes the parameterized complexity of  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA with respect to  $n + s$  vis-a-vis  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS with respect to  $k$ .

► **Theorem 3.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{G}$  is a hereditary family of graphs. Then,  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA is FPT parameterized by  $n + s$  if and only if  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS is FPT parameterized by  $k$ .*

Even though the above theorem establishes the link between these two problems, it does not identify the graph classes on which these problems will be tractable. While there are papers that study hereditary graph classes for the MWIS problem (see, for example, [11]), we are not aware of known classes of graphs for which SB-MWIS is FPT parameterized by  $k$ . Hence, we introduce the notion of  $f$ -independence friendly graph classes and prove that the problem admits an FPT algorithm when restricted to this graph class.

► **Definition (Independence Friendly Graph Class).** *Consider  $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a monotonically increasing and an invertible function. A graph class  $\mathcal{G}$  is called  $f$ -independence friendly class ( $f$ -ifc) if  $\mathcal{G}$  is hereditary and for every  $n$ -vertex graph  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  has an independent set of size  $f(n)$ .*

► **Theorem 4.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be an  $f$ -independence friendly class. Then, there exists an algorithm for  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS running in time  $\mathcal{O}((f^{-1}(k))^k \cdot (n + m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ , and hence an algorithm for  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA running in time  $2^{\mathcal{O}(ns)} \cdot (f^{-1}(s))^s \cdot (m + \log(\eta))^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$*

Some examples of  $f$ -independence friendly graph classes are bipartite graphs, planar graphs, graphs of bounded degeneracy, graphs excluding a fixed clique as an induced subgraph, etc.

As the last of our main results, we consider a parameter  $\pi$  of graph that is not 0 for edgeless graphs. One of the most obvious parameters is the number of non-edges. Note that dense edges, representing multiple conflicts between jobs, naturally bound the number of items that can be assigned to a particular agent. Consider a simple example where  $\mathcal{H}$  is a complete graph on  $m$  vertices, i.e., it has  $\binom{m}{2}$  many edges. Then, we can only assign one jobs to each agent. Hence, the problem reduces to finding a matching in an auxiliary bipartite graph across the set of agents and set of jobs. This raises the natural question whether the number of non-edges  $t$  is a fruitful parameter. The following theorem answers this question positively by presenting an FPT algorithm when parameterized by  $t$ . Moreover, if we consider additional parameters as the number of agents  $n$ , we get an improved FPT algorithm.

► **Theorem 5.** *All the variants of the CFFA problem, when restricted to the case where the conflict graph  $\mathcal{H}$  on  $m$  vertices has at least  $\binom{m}{2} - t$  many edges admits*

1. an algorithm running in time  $2^{\mathcal{O}(n \cdot \sqrt{t} \cdot \log(t))} \cdot (m + \log(\eta))^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ ; and
2. an algorithm running in time  $2^{\mathcal{O}(t \cdot \log(t))} \cdot (m + \log(\eta))^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ .

We remark that there are various points of view to consider the collection of complete graphs and accordingly define *the distance from triviality*. For example, the collection of graphs that are union of  $q$  many disjoint cliques is in close proximity of collection of cliques (for which  $q = 1$ ). However, our next result shows that such a result has limited success.

► **Theorem 6.** *All the variants of CFFA, when restricted to the case where the conflict graph  $\mathcal{H}$  is a union of  $q$  cliques*

1. *is solvable in polynomial time when  $q = 2$  and utility functions are uniform, i.e., the utility functions are the same for all the agents; and*
2. *is NP-hard when  $q = 2$  and  $\eta = 3$  (but utility function is not uniform).*

Finally, we turn our attention to *kernelization* of the problem. We say that two instances,  $(I, k)$  and  $(I', k')$ , of a parameterized problem  $\Pi$  are *equivalent* if  $(I, k) \in \Pi$  if and only if  $(I', k') \in \Pi$ . A *reduction rule*, for a parameterized problem  $\Pi$  is an algorithm that takes an instance  $(I, k)$  of  $\Pi$  as input and outputs an instance  $(I', k')$  of  $\Pi$  in time polynomial in  $|I|$  and  $k$ . If  $(I, k)$  and  $(I', k')$  are equivalent instances then we say the reduction rule is *safe*. A parameterized problem  $\Pi$  is said to have a *kernel* of size  $g(k)$  (or  $g(k)$ -kernel) if there is a polynomial-time algorithm (called a *kernelization algorithm*) which takes as an input  $(I, k)$ , and in time  $(|I| + k)^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$  returns an equivalent instance  $(I', k')$  of  $\Pi$  such that  $|I'| + k' \leq g(k)$ . Here,  $g(\cdot)$  is a computable function whose value depends only on  $k$ . It is known that a problem  $\Pi$  admits an FPT result if and only if it admits a kernel. For more details on parameterized complexity, we refer the reader to the books by Cygan et al. [8].

► **Theorem 7.** *Both P-CFFA and C-CFFA have the following properties:*

1. *have a polynomial-sized kernel of size  $\tau \eta n^2$ , where  $\tau$  denotes the neighborhood diversity of the conflict graph;*
2. *have a polynomial-sized kernel of size  $d \eta n^2$  if  $d < n$ , where  $d$  is the maximum degree of the conflict graph; and*
3. *do not have a polynomial-sized kernel when parameterized by  $\text{tw} + n$  unless  $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP} \setminus \text{poly}$ , where  $\text{tw}$  be the treewidth of the conflict graph. Moreover, the same result holds even for  $\text{tw} + \eta + n$  on C-CFFA.*

However, the kernelization complexity starts to differ between P-CFFA and C-CFFA when in addition to the threshold value we consider structural parameters such as the maximum degree (when greater than the number of agents), chromatic number, and size of the largest clique.

► **Theorem 8.**

1. *If  $d > n$ , P-CFFA has a polynomial-sized kernel of size  $d \eta n^2$ , where  $d$  denotes the maximum degree of the conflict graph. However, C-CFFA becomes NP-hard even when  $d + \eta + n$  is a constant.*
2. *P-CFFA admits polynomial-sized kernel of size  $\chi \eta n^2$  and  $\mathcal{O}(n(r + \eta n)^r)$ , where  $\chi$  is the chromatic number, and  $r$  is the size of the maximum clique in the conflict graph. Contrastingly, C-CFFA remains NP-hard for even constant values of  $\chi + r + \eta + n$ .*

## 2 Proof of Theorem 1

► **Theorem 1.** *We prove that*

1. C-CFFA
  - a. *admits a polynomial time algorithm if  $n = 1$  even if  $\eta$  is large; and*
  - b. *is NP-hard for (i) any  $n \geq 2$  even if the binary encoding  $\eta$  is a polynomial function of  $m$ ; as well as (ii) any  $n \geq 3$  even if  $\eta = 1$ .*
2. P-CFFA *is NP-hard for any  $n \geq 1$  even if  $\eta$  is at most  $m$  (and range of  $ut$  is  $\{1\}$ ).*
3. Both SB-C-CFFA and SB-P-CFFA
  - a. *admit polynomial-time algorithms when (i) both  $n$  and  $s$  are constants (even if  $\eta$  is large), or (ii)  $s = 1$  (even if  $\eta$  is large), and*
  - b. *are NP-hard (i) for any  $n \geq 1$  even if the binary encoding of  $\eta$  is a polynomial function of  $m$ , or (ii) for any  $\eta \geq 2$  and any  $s \geq 2$ .*

**Proof.**

### 1. Results regarding C-CFFA.

Consider the case when  $n = 1$ . Note that in this case, an instance is a (trivial) yes-instance if and only if  $\mathcal{H}$  is an edgeless graph and the sum of the utilities of all the items is at least  $\eta$ . Both of these checks can be completed in polynomial time.

Consider the case when  $n \geq 2$ . We present a reduction from the PARTITION problem (Problem [SP12] in [16]). Recall that in this problem, an input is a finite set  $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{|P|}\}$  of integers and the objective is to find a subset  $P' \subseteq P$  such that  $\sum_{p_i \in P'} p_i = \sum_{p_j \in P \setminus P'} p_j$ . The problem remains NP-hard even when length of encoding of  $\max_{p_i \in P} \{p_i\}$  is polynomial in  $|P|$ . The reduction constructs an instance of SB-C-CFFA by adding two agents  $a_1, a_2$  to  $\mathcal{A}$ , an item  $v_i$  to  $\mathcal{I}$  corresponding to every element in set  $P$ , and defining  $\eta = (\sum_{p_i \in P} p_i)/2$  and  $ut_1(v_i) = ut_2(v_i) = p_i$ . The reduction returns  $(\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2\}, \mathcal{I}, \{ut_1, ut_2\}, \mathcal{H}, \eta)$  as the reduced instance where  $\mathcal{H}$  is an edgeless graph. The correctness of the reduction follows easily as the partition of vertices corresponds to the assignment of items to two agents. It is easy to extend the reduction for any value of  $n \geq 2$  by adding  $(n - 2)$  dummy items whose valuation is  $\eta$  for any every agent. Finally, the utility functions ensure that all the items needs to be assigned.

For the case when  $n \geq 3$ , consider a reduction from the 3-COLORING problem (Problem [GT4] in [16]). In this problem, given graph  $G$ , the objective is to determine whether there exists a coloring  $\phi : V(G) \mapsto \{1, 2, 3\}$  such that for any edge  $uv \in E(G)$ ,  $\phi(u) \neq \phi(v)$ . Consider the reduction that, given an instance of the 3-COLORING problem, construct an instance of CFFA by adding three agents, say  $a_1, a_2, a_3$ , to  $\mathcal{A}$ , adding an item with respect to each vertex in  $G$  to  $\mathcal{I}$ , and defining  $ut_1(v) = ut_2(v) = ut_3(v) = 1$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ ,  $\eta = 1$ , and  $\mathcal{H} = G$ . It is easy to verify that a proper 3-coloring  $\phi$  of  $V(G)$  corresponds to a valid assignment of items to agents and vice-versa. A similar reduction starting from  $\eta$ -COLORING implies that the problem is NP-hard for any  $\eta \geq 3$ .

### 2. Results regarding P-CFFA.

Consider the INDEPENDENT SET problem. The input consists of a graph  $G$  and an integer  $k$ , and the objective is to find a set of vertices  $S$  of size  $k$  such that for any two vertices  $S$  are not adjacent to each other. Consider a reduction that, given an instance of INDEPENDENT SET, constructs an instance of P-CFFA with one agent  $a_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ , an item in  $\mathcal{I}$  corresponding

to every vertex in  $V(G)$ ,  $ut_1(v) = 1$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ ,  $\eta = k$ , and  $\mathcal{H} = G$ . It is easy to verify that an independent set  $S$  of size  $k$  corresponds to a partial assignment of  $k$  items to the agent. This implies the desired hardness result.

### 3. Results regarding SB-C-CFFA and SB-P-CFFA.

We prove that both the problems admit algorithms running in time  $m^{\mathcal{O}(ns)} \cdot poly(m, \eta)$ , and hence, it is polynomial-time solvable when  $n$  and  $s$  are constants. The algorithm enumerates all the subset of items of size at most  $s$  in time  $m^{\mathcal{O}(s)}$ . These sets will act as a bundle that will be assigned to agents. It discards the bundles that are not an independent set in conflict graph  $\mathcal{H}$ . For the  $n$  agents, there are  $(m^{\mathcal{O}(s)})^n$  many possible assignments of these bundles. The algorithm iterates through all these assignments. It discards the assignments in which the evaluation of bundle for that a particular agent is less than  $\eta$  or the intersection of two bundles assigned to different agents is non-empty. The correctness of the algorithm follows from the fact that it exhaustively searches all the valid assignments and the running time follows from the description.


Consider the case when  $s = 1$ . As the valuation of any agent has non-negative integer values, it suffices to assign one appropriate job to each agent. Towards this, we consider an auxiliary bipartite graph  $\mathcal{B}$  across agents and jobs and edges representing the feasibility of useful assignments. Formally, construct a bipartite graph  $\mathcal{B}$  with a bipartition  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{I}$ . For an agent  $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$  and a job  $v_j \in \mathcal{I}$ , we add an edge  $(a_i, v_j)$  if and only if  $\phi_i(v_j) \leq \eta$ . It is easy to see that a matching saturating  $\mathcal{A}$  corresponds to the desired partial assignment of jobs. For the SB-C-CFFA version, we need a perfect matching, whereas for SB-P-CFFA, we need a matching saturating  $\mathcal{A}$ . As there is a polynomial time algorithm to compute the matching [20], both problems admit a polynomial-time algorithm when  $s = 1$ . The hardness results for the case when  $n \geq 1$  follow from the corresponding case for P-CFFA. Also, the hardness result for the later case follows from the corresponding case when  $\mathcal{H}$  is an edgeless graph.

We now consider the case when  $\eta \geq 2$  and  $s \geq 2$ . We present a reduction from the 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING to the SB-C-CFFA with  $\eta = 2$  and  $s = 2$ . Later, we mention how to extend this result for any  $\eta \geq 2$  and  $s \geq 2$ . We note that the utility functions and the target value are defined in such a way that even for an instance of SB-P-CFFA, one needs to assign all items to agents. Hence, the same reduction holds even for SB-P-CFFA.

An input instance of 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING consists of three finite sets  $X, Y$  and  $Z$  with  $T \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$ , where, for each  $(x, y, z) \in T$ ,  $x \in X, y \in Y, z \in Z$ . And, the objective is to determine whether there exists a subset  $M \subseteq T$  with a cardinality of  $\ell$ , where for any two distinct tuples  $(x_1, y_1, z_1), (x_2, y_2, z_2) \in M$ , we have  $x_1 \neq x_2, y_1 \neq y_2$ , and  $z_1 \neq z_2$ . Note that  $|X| = |Y| = |Z|$ . Finding a perfect 3-dimensional matching was one of the first problems that was proved to be NP-hard (Problem [SP1] in [16]). We consider a restricted version of the problem where every element appears in at most three tuples in  $T$ . (See remark after Problem [SP1] in [16].) Moreover, we rename the elements in  $X \cup Y$  as follows: Consider a vertex  $z_i \in Z$  and  $t_i^1, t_i^2$  and  $t_i^3$  be three tuples that include  $z_i$ . Note that all three tuples may not exist. If  $t_i^j = (x_{i'}, y_{i''), z_i)$  for some  $i \in [|Z|]$  and  $j \in [3]$ , then we rename vertex  $x_{i'}$  as  $t_i^j(x)$  and  $y_{i''}$  as  $t_i^j(y)$ . Note that if  $z_i \in Z$  appears in no tuple, then we are dealing with a trivial no-instance. And, if  $z_i$  appears in a unique tuple, then we need to include that tuple in any solution, thus simplifying the instance. Hence, it is safe to assume that every vertex appears in two or three tuples in  $T$ .

The reduction constructs an equivalent instance of the SB-C-CFFA problem as follows. See Figure 2 for an illustration.





■ **Figure 2** Illustration of Reduction for Theorem 1.3.b(ii), i.e., when  $\eta \geq 2$  and  $s \geq 2$ .

- For every vertex  $z_i \in Z$ , that appears two tuples, it adds two unique agents, say  $z_{i1}, z_{i2}$ , to the collection of agents  $\mathcal{A}$ . Similarly, for every vertex  $z_i \in Z$ , that appears in three tuples, it adds three unique agents, say  $z_{i1}, z_{i2}, z_{i3}$ , to the collection of agents  $\mathcal{A}$ . For notational convenience, we denote the agents in  $\mathcal{A}$  as  $z_{ij}$  for  $i \in [|Z|]$  and  $j \in [3]$ .
- For every  $u \in X \uplus Y$ , reduction introduces an item. Also, for every vertex  $z_i \in Z$  that appears in two tuples (respectively in three tuples), the reduction adds one dummy item  $d_{i1}$  (respectively two dummy items  $d_{i1}$  and  $d_{i2}$ ). Let  $D$  be the collection for all the items introduced in this step. Formally,  $\mathcal{I} = X \uplus Y \uplus D$ .
- For every agent  $z_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}$ , define the utility functions  $ut_{ij}$  as follows:

$$ut_{ij}(v) = \begin{cases} 1, & v \in \{t_i^j(x), t_i^j(y)\} \text{ for every tuple } (t_i^j(x), t_i^j(y), z_i) \in T, \\ 2, & v \in \{d_{i1}, d_{i2}\} \text{ for each } z_i \in Z, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The reduction returns  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{ut_{ij} | z_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}\}, \mathcal{H}, s = 2, \eta = 2)$  as the reduced instance where  $\mathcal{H}$  is an edgeless graph.

We now prove that both these instances are equivalent. In the forward direction, if there is a 3-dimensional perfect matching  $M$  of size  $|Z|$  with the tuples  $\{t_1^1, t_2^1, \dots, t_n^1\} \subseteq T$ , we can construct an equivalent satisfying assignment of items to the agents in the C-CFFA problem as follows: For each tuple  $t_i^1 \in M$ , agent  $z_{i1}$  meets the utility requirement of two by acquiring the other two items (from  $X \uplus Y$  in the tuple  $t_i^1$ ), each endowed with a weight value of one. And agents  $z_{i2}$  and  $z_{i3}$  (if it exists) can acquire  $d_{i1}$  and  $d_{i2}$  (if it exists), respectively, each with a utility value of two. Thus, a satisfying assignment is attained.

In the backward direction, suppose a satisfying assignment for the SB-C-CFFA exists, ensuring each agent receives a utility value of two. Consider agents,  $z_{i1}, z_{i2}$  corresponding to vertex  $z_i \in Z$  that appears in two tuples. Note that the items from set  $D$  can satisfy one of these agents, the other agent requirements need to be satisfied by elements in  $X \uplus Y$ . A similar argument holds for agent corresponding to  $z_i \in Z$  that appears on three tuples. One of the three agents' requirements corresponding to this vertex needs to be satisfied by items in  $X \uplus Y$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $z_{i1}$ s are the remaining agents that are not assigned any items from  $D$ . But then these  $n$  agents must meet their utility requirements using the items from  $X \uplus Y$  where each agent receives a disjoint set from the other, consisting of two items. Furthermore for any agent  $z_{i1}$ , the two assigned items must be  $t_i^1(x)$  and  $t_i^1(y)$ , the only two elements capable of providing positive utility value from  $X \uplus Y$ . And hence the existence of a  $|Z|$  size matching  $\{(t_i^1(x), t_i^1(y), z_i)\}_{i \in [n]}$  follows.

We can extend the above hardness result for any value of  $\eta \geq 2$  and  $s \geq 2$ . We can introduce  $|\mathcal{A}|$  many isolated elements each with value  $\eta - 2$  for every agent. Also, note that the threshold constraints and the number of total items ensures that no agent can get more than 2 items. Hence, the hardness holds for any value of  $s \geq 2$ . Finally, once again, because of the constraints mentioned in the previous sentence, the reduction holds for any variation of SB-C-CFFA.  $\blacktriangleleft$

### 3 Proof of Theorem 2

► **Theorem 2.** *All four variants of CFFA admit an algorithm running in time  $2^m \cdot (m + \log(\eta))^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ . Moreover, unless the ETH fails, none of the variations admits an algorithm running in time  $2^{\mathcal{O}(m)} \cdot (m + \log(\eta))^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ .*

**Proof.** The algorithm uses the technique of polynomial multiplication and fast Fourier transformation. The idea is as follows. For every agent  $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ , where  $i \in [n]$ , we first construct a family of bundles that can be assigned to the agent  $a_i$  in an optimal solution. Let us denote this family by  $\mathcal{F}_i$ . Then, our goal is to find  $n$  disjoint bundles, one from each set  $\mathcal{F}_i$ . To find these disjoint sets efficiently, we use the technique of polynomial multiplication.

Before we discuss our algorithm, we have to introduce some notations and terminologies. Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a set of size  $m$ , then we can associate  $\mathcal{I}$  with  $[m]$ . The *characteristic vector* of a subset  $S \subseteq [m]$ , denoted by  $\chi(S)$ , is an  $m$ -length vector whose  $i^{\text{th}}$  bit is 1 if and only if  $i \in S$ . Two binary strings of length  $m$  are said to be disjoint if, for each  $i \in [m]$ , the  $i^{\text{th}}$  bits in the two strings are different. The *Hamming weight* of a binary string  $S$ , denoted by  $H(S)$ , is defined as the number of 1s in the string  $S$ . A monomial  $y^i$  is said to have Hamming weight  $w$ , if the degree  $i$  when represented as a binary string, has Hamming weight  $w$ . We begin with the following facts observed in Cygan et. al [9]: Let  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  be two binary strings of the same length. Let  $S = S_1 + S_2$ . If  $H(S) = H(S_1) + H(S_2)$ , then  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are disjoint binary vectors. Also, let  $S = S_1 \cup S_2$ , where  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are two disjoint subsets of  $[m]$ . Then,  $\chi(S) = \chi(S_1) + \chi(S_2)$  and  $H(\chi(S)) = H(\chi(S_1)) + H(\chi(S_2)) = |S_1| + |S_2|$ . These two facts together yield the following.

► **Observation 9.** *Subsets  $S_1, S_2 \subseteq \mathcal{I}$  are disjoint if and only if Hamming weight of the monomial  $x^{\chi(S_1) + \chi(S_2)}$  is  $|S_1| + |S_2|$ .*

The *Hamming projection* of a polynomial  $p(y)$  to  $h$ , denoted by  $H_h(p(y))$ , is the sum of all the monomials of  $p(y)$  which have Hamming weight  $h$ . We define the *representative polynomial* of  $p(y)$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{R}(p(y))$ , as the sum of all the monomials that have non-zero coefficient in  $p(y)$  but have coefficient 1 in  $\mathcal{R}(p(y))$ , i.e., it ignores the actual coefficients and only remembers whether the coefficient is non-zero. We say that a polynomial  $p(y)$  *contains a monomial  $y^i$*  if the coefficient of  $y^i$  is non-zero. The zero polynomial is the one in which the coefficient of each monomial is 0.

Now, we are ready to discuss our algorithm. We focus the algorithm on P-CFFA and highlight the required changes for the other two variants.

**Algorithm.** Let  $\mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}, \eta)$  denote an instance of P-CFFA. We start by defining a set family indexed by the agents. For an agent  $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ , let  $\mathcal{F}_i$  contain each of subsets of  $\mathcal{I}$  that can be *feasibly* allocated to  $a_i$  as a bundle. Specifically, a set  $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}$  is in  $\mathcal{F}_i$  if  $S$  is an independent set in  $\mathcal{H}$  and the utility  $\sum_{x \in S} \text{ut}_i(x) \geq \eta$  (subset size is at most  $s$  for the size-bounded variants). We define the *round* inductively as follows.

For round 1 and a positive integer  $s^*$ , we define a polynomial

$$p_{s^*}^1(y) = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{F}_1, |S|=s^*} y^{\chi(S)}$$

For round  $i \in [n] \setminus \{1\}$ , and a positive integer  $s^*$ , we define a polynomial by using the  $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$  operator

$$p_{s^*}^i(y) = \sum_{\substack{S \in \mathcal{F}_i \\ s' = s^* - |S|}} \mathcal{R} \left( H_{s^*} \left( p_{s'}^{i-1}(y) \times y^{\chi(S)} \right) \right)$$

The algorithm returns “yes” if for any positive integer  $s^* \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  ( $s^* = m$  for complete version), the polynomial  $p_{s^*}^n(y)$  is non-zero.

In fact, any non-zero monomial in the polynomial “represents” a solution for the instance  $\mathcal{J}$  such that we can find the bundle to assign to each agent  $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$  by backtracking the process all the way to round 1.

We now describe how the algorithm computes a solution, if one exists. We assume that for some positive integer  $s^*$ ,  $p_{s^*}^n(y)$  is a non-zero polynomial. Thus, it contains a non-zero monomial of the form  $p_{s'}^{n-1}(y) \times y^{\chi(S)}$ , where  $S \in \mathcal{F}_n$ . Note that  $\chi(S)$  describes the bundle assigned to agent  $a_n$ , the set  $S$ . Since the monomial  $p_{s'}^{n-1}(y) \times y^{\chi(S)}$  exists in the polynomial  $p_{s^*}^n(y)$  after applying  $H_{s^*}(\cdot)$  function, it must be that  $p_{s'}^{n-1}(y) = y^{\chi(S')}$  for some set  $S' \subseteq \mathcal{I}$  such that  $S' \cap S = \emptyset$ . By recursively applying the same argument to the polynomial  $p_{s'}^{n-1}(y)$ , we can obtain the bundles that are allocated to the agents  $a_{n-1}, \dots, a_1$ .

**Correctness.** We prove that the above algorithm returns “yes” if and only if  $\mathcal{J}$  is a yes-instance of P-CFFA. Suppose that  $\mathcal{J}$  is a yes-instance of P-CFFA. Then, there is an *assignment*, i.e., an injective function  $\phi$  that maps jobs to agents. For each agent  $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ , where  $i \in [n]$ , we define  $S_i = \phi^{-1}(i)$ . We begin with the following claim that enables us to conclude that the polynomial  $p_{s^*}^n(y)$ , where  $s^* = \sum_{i \in [n]} |S_i|$ , contains the monomial  $y^{\sum_{i \in [n]} \chi(S_i)}$ .

▷ **Claim 10.** For each  $j \in [n]$ , the polynomial  $p_{s^*}^j(y)$ , where  $s^* = \sum_{i \in [j]} |S_i|$ , contains the monomial  $y^{\sum_{i \in [j]} \chi(S_i)}$ .

*Proof:* The proof is by induction on  $j$ . Consider the case when  $j = 1$ . We first note that  $S_1$  is in the family  $\mathcal{F}_1$  as it is a feasible bundle for the agent 1. Thus, due to the construction of the polynomial  $p_{s^*}^1(y)$ , we know that  $p_{|S_1|}^1(y)$  contains the monomial  $y^{\chi(S_1)}$ .

Now, consider the induction step. Suppose that the claim is true for  $j = j' - 1$ . We next prove it for  $j = j'$ . To construct the polynomial  $p_{s^*}^{j'}(y)$ , where  $s^* = \sum_{i \in [j']} |S_i|$ , we consider the multiplication of polynomial  $p_{s'}^{j'-1}(y)$ , where  $s' = \sum_{i \in [j'-1]} |S_i|$ , and  $y^{\chi(S_{j'})}$ . Due to the inductive hypothesis,  $p_{s'}^{j'-1}(y)$ , where  $s' = \sum_{i \in [j'-1]} |S_i|$ , contains the monomial  $y^{\sum_{i \in [j'-1]} \chi(S_i)}$ . Note that  $S_{j'}$  is in the family  $\mathcal{F}_{j'}$  as it is a feasible bundle for the agent  $j'$ . Since  $S_{j'}$  is disjoint from  $S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_{j'-1}$ , due to Observation 9, we can infer that  $p_{s^*}^{j'}(y)$ , where  $s^* = \sum_{i \in [j']} |S_i|$ , has the monomial  $y^{\sum_{i \in [j']} \chi(S_i)}$ . ◊

Due to Claim 10, we can conclude that  $p_{s^*}^n(y)$ , where  $s^* = \sum_{i \in [n]} |S_i|$ , contains the monomial  $y^{\sum_{i \in [n]} \chi(S_i)}$ . For the other direction, suppose that the algorithm returns “yes”. Then, for some positive integer  $s^*$ ,  $p_{s^*}^n(y)$  is a non-zero polynomial. We need to show that

there exists pairwise disjoint sets  $S_1, \dots, S_n$  such that  $S_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$ , where  $i \in [n]$ . This will give us an assignment function  $\phi$ , where for all  $x \in \mathcal{I}$ ,  $\phi(x) = i$ , if  $x \in S_i$ , where  $i \in [n]$ . Since each  $S \in \mathcal{F}_i$ , where  $i \in [n]$ , is an independent set and  $\sum_{x \in S} \text{ut}_i(x) \geq \eta$ ,  $\phi$  is a feasible assignment. We next prove the following claim that enables us to conclude the existence of pairwise disjoint sets.

▷ **Claim 11.** For each  $j \in [n]$ , if the polynomial  $p_{s^*}^j(y)$  is non-zero for some  $s^* \in [m]$ , then there exists  $j$  pairwise disjoint sets  $S_1, \dots, S_j$  such that  $S_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$ , where  $i \in [j]$ .

*Proof:* We prove it by induction on  $j$ . Consider the base case when  $j = 1$ . Suppose  $p_{s^*}^1(y)$  is non-zero for some  $s^* \in [m]$ . Then, it contains a monomial  $y^{x(S)}$ , where  $S \in \mathcal{F}_1$ . Thus, the claim is true.

Now consider the induction step. Suppose that the claim is true for  $j = j' - 1$ . We next prove it for  $j = j'$ . Suppose that  $p_{s^*}^{j'}(y)$  is non-zero for some  $s^* \in [m]$ . Then, it contains a monomial of the form  $p_{s'}^{j'-1}(y) \times y^{x(S)}$ , where  $|S| = s^* - s'$  and  $S \in \mathcal{F}_{j'}$ . Due to induction hypothesis, since  $p_{s'}^{j'-1}(y)$  is a non-zero polynomial, there exists  $j' - 1$  pairwise disjoint sets  $S_1, \dots, S_{j'-1}$  such that  $S_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$ , where  $i \in [j' - 1]$ . Furthermore, due to Observation 9, we have that  $S_{j'}$  is disjoint from  $S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_{j'-1}$ . Thus, we have  $j'$  pairwise disjoint sets  $S_1, \dots, S_{j'}$  such that  $S_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$ , where  $i \in [j']$ . ◊

This completes the proof for P-CFFA.

To argue the correctness of the C-CFFA, recall that we return yes, when  $p_m^n(y)$  is a non-zero polynomial. The correctness proof is exactly the same as for P-CFFA. Note that it also remains the same for the size-bounded variant, as we have taken care of size while constructing families for each agent.

**Running time.** We argue that the algorithm runs in  $\mathcal{O}(2^m \cdot (n + m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$  time. In the algorithm, we first construct a family of feasible bundles for each agent  $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ . Since we check all the subsets of  $\mathcal{I}$ , the constructions of families takes  $\mathcal{O}(2^m \cdot (n + m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$  time. For  $i = 1$ , we construct  $m$  polynomials that contains  $\mathcal{O}(2^m)$  terms. Thus,  $p_s^1(y)$  can be constructed in  $\mathcal{O}(2^m \cdot m)$  time. Then, we recursively construct polynomials by polynomial multiplication. Recall that there exists an algorithm that multiplies two polynomials of degree  $d$  in  $\mathcal{O}(d \log d)$  time [26]. Since every polynomial has the degree at most  $\mathcal{O}(2^m)$ , every polynomial multiplication takes  $\mathcal{O}(2^m \cdot m)$  time. Hence, the algorithm runs in  $\mathcal{O}(2^m \cdot (n + m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$  time.

We first consider the complete variant of the problem. To prove the lower bound for C-CFFA, we give a polynomial time reduction from the 3-COLORING problem, in which given a graph  $G$ , the goal is to check whether the vertices of  $G$  can be colored using 3 colors so that no two neighbors share the same color. For a given instance  $G$  of 3-COLORING, we construct an instance of C-CFFA as follows:  $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ ,  $\mathcal{I} = V(G)$  and  $G$  is the conflict graph. For each  $i \in [3]$  and  $x \in \mathcal{I}$ ,  $\text{ut}_i(x) = 1$ , and the target value  $\eta = 1$ . It is easy to see that this simple reduction constructs an equivalent instance. Since, 3-COLORING does not admit an algorithm running in time  $2^{\mathcal{O}(m)}$  unless the ETH fails, we get the lower bound result (See, for example, Chapter 14 in [10]).

Next, we move to the partial variant of the problem. Towards this, we give a polynomial time reduction from the INDEPENDENT SET problem. Given an instance  $\mathcal{I} = (G, k)$  of INDEPENDENT SET, we create an equivalent instance  $\mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, G, \eta)$  of the P-CFFA problem as follows:  $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1\}$ ,  $\mathcal{I} = V(G)$ ,  $\text{ut}_1(x) = 1$  for each jobs  $x \in \mathcal{I}$ . The target value  $\eta$  is set to  $k$ . It is important to note that any independent set in graph  $G$  of size at least  $k$  is simultaneously a valid allocation for the sole agent in the reduced instance.

The converse is also true, meaning that any appropriate assignment to the single agent corresponds to an independent set of size at least  $k$  in  $G$ . Since INDEPENDENT SET does not admit an algorithm that runs in time  $2^{o(m)}$  unless the ETH fails, our claim holds true (Once again, see Chapter 14 in [10].) Observe that the same reduction works for SB-P-CFFA as well.

Moving forward, we focus on SB-C-CFFA and we give a similar reduction from INDEPENDENT SET. Given an instance  $\mathcal{I} = (G, k)$  of INDEPENDENT SET, we create an equivalent instance  $\mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, G, s, \eta)$  of the SB-C-CFFA problem as follows:  $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{m-k+1}\}$ ,  $\mathcal{I} = V(G)$ ,  $\text{ut}_1(x) = 1$  for each jobs  $x \in \mathcal{I}$ , and  $\text{ut}_{i \in [n] \setminus \{1\}}(x) = k$ ,  $i \in [n] \setminus \{1\}$  for each jobs  $x \in \mathcal{I}$ . The target value  $\eta$  is set to  $k$  and  $s = k$ . Note that any independent set of size  $k$  provides a satisfying assignment to the agent  $a_1$ . The remaining  $(m - k)$  jobs can satisfy the other  $(m - k)$  agents in the reduced instance. The reverse direction follows from the fact that any valid satisfying assignment to the agent  $a_1$  corresponds to an independent set of size  $k$  in  $G$ . Thus, the theorem is proved.  $\blacktriangleleft$

## 4 Proof of Theorem 3 and Theorem 4

We begin with the proof of Theorem 3.

► **Theorem 3.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{G}$  is a hereditary family of graphs. Then,  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA is FPT parameterized by  $n + s$  if and only if  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS is FPT parameterized by  $k$ .*

Let  $\mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}, s, \eta)$  be an instance of  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA, and let  $|\mathcal{J}|$  denote the size of the instance. We first prove the first part of Theorem 3, which is the easier direction of the proof. In particular, let  $\mathbb{A}$  be an FPT algorithm for  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA, running in time  $f(n, s)|\mathcal{J}|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ . Given an instance  $(G, k, \rho, w)$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS, we construct an instance  $\mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}, s, \eta)$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA as follows. The set of agents  $\mathcal{A}$  has only one agent  $a_1$ . Further,  $\mathcal{I} = V(G)$ ,  $\text{ut}_1 = w$ ,  $\mathcal{H} = G$ ,  $s = k$ , and  $\eta = \rho$ . It is easy to see that  $(G, k, \rho, w)$  is a yes-instance of  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS if and only if  $\mathcal{J}$  is a yes-instance of  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA. Thus, by invoking algorithm  $\mathbb{A}$  on instance  $\mathcal{J}$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA, we get an FPT algorithm for  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS that runs in  $f(k)|\mathcal{J}|^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$  time. This completes the proof in the forward direction. Next, we prove the reverse direction of the proof. That is, given an FPT algorithm for  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS, we design an FPT algorithm for  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA. For ease of explanation, we first present a randomized algorithm which will be derandomized later using the known tool of  $(p, q)$ -perfect hash family [2, 15].

**Randomized Algorithm.** We design a randomized algorithm with the following specification. If the input,  $\mathcal{J}$ , is a no-instance then the algorithm always returns “no”. However, if the input,  $\mathcal{J}$ , is a yes-instance then the algorithm returns “yes” with probability at least  $1/2$ .

We throughout assume that we have been given a yes-instance. This implies that there exists a hypothetical solution  $\phi: \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ . We define everything with respect to  $\phi$ . That is,  $\phi: \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is a partial assignment satisfying all the requirements. Let  $S = \phi^{-1}(\mathcal{A}) = \cup_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \phi^{-1}(a)$ , i.e., the set of jobs that are assigned to some agent. Further, note that  $|S| \leq ns$ , as the size of each bundle is upper bounded by  $s$ . Our main idea is to first highlight all the jobs in the set  $S$ , that are assigned to some agent, using color coding as follows: color the vertices of  $\mathcal{H}$  uniformly and independently at random using  $ns$  colors, say  $\{1, \dots, ns\}$ .

The goal of the coloring is that “with high probability”, we color the jobs assigned to agents in a solution using distinct colors. The following proposition bounds the success probability.

► **Proposition 12.** [8, Lemma 5.4] *Let  $U$  be a universe and  $X \subseteq U$ . Let  $\chi: U \rightarrow [|X|]$  be a function that colors each element of  $U$  with one of  $|X|$  colors uniformly and independently at random. Then, the probability that the elements of  $X$  are colored with pairwise distinct colors is at least  $e^{-|X|}$ .*

Due to Proposition 12, the coloring step of the algorithm colors the jobs in  $\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$  using distinct colors with probability at least  $e^{-ns}$ . We call an assignment  $\phi: \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  as *colorful* if every two jobs  $\{i, i'\} \in \phi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$  get distinct color. Moreover, for each agent  $a$ ,  $|\phi^{-1}(a)| \leq s$ .

Next, we find a *colorful* feasible assignment in the following lemma. Further, let us assume that we have an FPT algorithm,  $\mathbb{B}$ , for  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS running in time  $h(k)n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ .

► **Lemma 13.** *Let  $\mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{ut_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}, s, \eta)$  be an instance of  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA and  $\chi: V(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow [ns]$  be a coloring function. Then, there exists a dynamic programming algorithm that finds a colorful feasible assignment  $\phi: \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathcal{O}(3^{ns} \cdot h(s) \cdot (n+m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$  time, if it exists, otherwise, return “no”.*

**Proof.** Let  $\text{colors} = \{1, \dots, ns\}$  be the set of colors and let  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  be an arbitrary order of the agents. For  $S \subseteq \text{colors}$ , let  $V_S$  be the subset of vertices in  $\mathcal{H}$  that are colored using the colors in  $S$ . We apply dynamic programming: for a non-empty set  $S \subseteq \text{colors}$  and  $i \in [n]$ , we define the table entry  $T[i, S]$  as 1 if there is a feasible assignment of jobs in  $V_S$  to agents  $\{a_1, \dots, a_i\}$ ; otherwise it is 0. Note that we are not *demanding* that the feasible assignment be colorful. For an agent  $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $S \subseteq \text{colors}$ , let  $\mathcal{H}_{a_i, S}$  be a vertex-weighted graph constructed as follows. Let  $V_S$  be the subset of vertices in  $\mathcal{H}$  that are colored using the colors in  $S$ . Then,  $\mathcal{H}_{a_i, S} = \mathcal{H}[V_S]$ . The weight of every vertex  $x \in \mathcal{H}_{a_i, S}$  is  $ut_i(x)$ . For a vertex-weighted graph  $G$ , let  $\mathbb{I}(G) \in \{0, 1\}$ , where  $\mathbb{I}(G) = 1$  if there exists an independent set of size at most  $s$  and weight at least  $\eta$  in  $G$ , otherwise 0. We compute  $\mathbb{I}(G)$  using algorithm  $\mathbb{B}$ . We compute the table entries as follows.

Base Case: For  $i = 1$  and non-empty set  $S$ , we compute as follows:

$$T[1, S] = \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{H}_{a_1, S}) \quad (1)$$

Recursive Step: For  $i > 1$  and non-empty set  $S$ , we compute as follows:

$$T[i, S] = \bigvee_{\emptyset \neq S' \subset S} T[i-1, S'] \wedge \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{H}_{a_i, S \setminus S'}) \quad (2)$$

We return “yes” if  $T[n, S] = 1$  for some  $S \subseteq \text{colors}$ , otherwise “no”. Next, we prove the correctness of the algorithm. Towards this, we prove that the Equation (1) and Equation (2) correctly compute  $T[i, S]$ , for each  $i \in [n]$  and  $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \text{colors}$ .

▷ **Claim 14.** Equation (1) and Equation (2) correctly compute  $T[i, S]$ , for each  $i \in [n]$  and  $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \text{colors}$ .

*Proof:* We will prove it by induction on  $i$ . For  $i = 1$ , we are looking for any feasible assignment of jobs colored using the colors in  $S$  to the agent  $a_1$ . Thus, Equation (1) computes  $T[1, S]$  correctly due to the construction of the graph  $\mathcal{H}_{a_1, S}$  and the correctness of algorithm  $\mathbb{B}$ .

Now, consider the recursive step. For  $i > 1$  and  $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \text{colors}$ , we compute  $T[i, S]$  using Equation (2). We show that the recursive formula is correct. Suppose that Equation (2) computes  $T[i', S]$  correctly, for all  $i' < i$  and  $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \text{colors}$ . First, we show that  $T[i, S]$  is at most the R.H.S. of Equation (2). If  $T[i, S] = 0$ , then the claim trivially holds. Suppose that  $T[i, S] = 1$ . Let  $\psi$  be a colorful feasible assignment to agents  $\{a_1, \dots, a_i\}$  using jobs that are colored using colors in  $S$ . Let  $S_j \subseteq S$  be the set of colors of jobs in  $\psi(a_j)$ , where  $j \in [i]$ .

Since  $\psi(a_i)$  uses the colors from the set  $S_i$  and  $\sum_{x \in \psi(a_i)} \mathbf{ut}_{a_i}(x) \geq \eta$ , due to the construction of  $\mathcal{H}_{a_i, S_i}$ , we have that  $\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{H}_{a_i, S_i}) = 1$ . Consider the assignment  $\psi' = \psi|_{\{a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}\}}$  (restrict the domain to  $\{a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}\}$ ). Since  $S_i$  is disjoint from  $S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_{i-1}$  due to the definition of colorful assignment,  $\psi'$  is a feasible assignment for the agents  $\{a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}\}$  such that the color of all the jobs in  $\psi'(\{a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}\})$  is in  $S \setminus S_i$ . Furthermore, since  $\psi$  is colorful,  $\psi'$  is also colorful. Therefore,  $T[i-1, S \setminus S_i] = 1$  due to the induction hypothesis. Hence, R.H.S. of Equation (2) is 1. Thus,  $T[i, S]$  is at most R.H.S. of Equation (2).

For the other direction, we show that  $T[i, S]$  is at least R.H.S. of Equation (2). If R.H.S. is 0, then the claim trivially holds. Suppose R.H.S. is 1. That is, there exist  $S' \subseteq S$  such that  $T[i-1, S'] = 1$  and  $\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{H}_{a_i, S \setminus S'}) = 1$ . Let  $\psi$  be a feasible assignment to agents  $\{a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}\}$  using jobs that are colored using the colors in  $S'$ . Since  $\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{H}_{a_i, S \setminus S'}) = 1$ , there exists a subset  $X \subseteq V_{S \setminus S'}$  such that  $\sum_{x \in X} \mathbf{ut}_{a_i}(x) \geq \eta$ . Thus, construct an assignment  $\psi'$  as follows:  $\psi'(a) = \psi(a)$ , if  $a \in \{a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}\}$  and  $\psi'(a_i) = X$ . Since  $\psi'$  is a feasible assignment and  $\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{H}_{a_i, S \setminus S'}) = 1$ ,  $\psi$  is a feasible assignment. Therefore,  $T[i, S] = 1$ .  $\diamond$  Therefore  $T[n, S] = 1$  for some  $S \subseteq \text{colors}$  if and only if  $\mathcal{J}$  is a yes-instance of  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA. This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\blacktriangleleft$

Due to Proposition 12 and Lemma 13, we obtain an  $\mathcal{O}(3^{ns} \cdot h(s) \cdot (n+m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$  time randomized algorithm for  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA which succeeds with probability  $e^{-ns}$ . Thus, by repeating the algorithm independently  $e^{ns}$  times, we obtain the following result.

**► Lemma 15.** *There exists a randomized algorithm that given an instance  $\mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\mathbf{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}, s, \eta)$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA either reports a failure or finds a feasible assignment in  $\mathcal{O}((3e)^{ns} \cdot h(s) \cdot (n+m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$  time. Moreover, if the algorithm is given a yes-instance, the algorithm returns “yes” with probability at least  $1/2$ , and if the algorithm is given a no-instance, the algorithm returns “no” with probability 1.*

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\mathbf{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}, s, \eta)$  be an instance of  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA. We color the jobs uniformly at random with colors  $[ns]$ . Let  $\chi: V(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow [ns]$  be this coloring function. We run the algorithm in Lemma 13 on the instance  $\mathcal{J}$  with coloring function  $\chi$ . If the algorithm returns “yes”, then we return “yes”. Otherwise, we report failure.

Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be a yes-instance of  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA and  $\phi$  be a hypothetical solution. Due to Proposition 12, all the jobs in  $\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$  are colored using distinct colors with probability at least  $e^{-ns}$ . Thus, the algorithm in Lemma 13 returns yes with probability at least  $e^{-ns}$ . Thus, to boost the success probability to a constant, we repeat the algorithm independently  $e^{ns}$  times. Thus, the success probability is at least

$$1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{e^{ns}}\right)^{e^{ns}} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{e} \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

If the algorithm returns “yes”, then clearly  $\mathcal{J}$  is a yes-instance of  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA due to Lemma 13.  $\blacktriangleleft$

**Deterministic Algorithm.** We derandomize the algorithm using  $(p, q)$ -perfect hash family to obtain a deterministic algorithm for our problem.

**► Definition 1** ( $(p, q)$ -perfect hash family). ([2]) *For non-negative integers  $p$  and  $q$ , a family of functions  $f_1, \dots, f_t$  from a universe  $U$  of size  $p$  to a universe of size  $q$  is called a  $(p, q)$ -perfect hash family, if for any subset  $S \subseteq U$  of size at most  $q$ , there exists  $i \in [t]$  such that  $f_i$  is injective on  $S$ .*

We can construct a  $(p, q)$ -perfect hash family using the following result.

► **Proposition 16** ([27, 8]). *There is an algorithm that given  $p, q \geq 1$  constructs a  $(p, q)$ -perfect hash family of size  $e^q q^{\mathcal{O}(\log q)} \log p$  in time  $e^q q^{\mathcal{O}(\log q)} p \log p$ .*

Let  $\mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}, s, \eta)$  be an instance of  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA. Instead of taking a random coloring  $\chi$ , we construct an  $(m, ns)$ -perfect hash family  $\mathcal{F}$  using Proposition 16. Then, for each function  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , we invoke the algorithm in Lemma 13 with the coloring function  $\chi = f$ . If there exists a feasible assignment  $\phi: \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  such that  $|\phi(a)| \leq s$ , for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , then there exists a function  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  that is injective on  $\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ , since  $\mathcal{F}$  is an  $(m, ns)$ -perfect hash family. Consequently, due to Lemma 13, the algorithm return “yes”. Hence, we obtain the following deterministic algorithm.

► **Theorem 17.** *There exists a deterministic algorithm for  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA running in time  $\mathcal{O}((3e)^{ns} \cdot (ns)^{\log ns} \cdot h(s) \cdot (n+m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ .*

Due to Theorem 17, we can conclude the following.

► **Corollary 18.** *If  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS is solvable in polynomial time, then there exists a deterministic algorithm for  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA running in time  $\mathcal{O}((3e)^{ns} \cdot (ns)^{\log ns} \cdot (n+m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ .*

It is possible that MWIS is polynomial-time solvable on  $\mathcal{G}$ , but  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS is NP-complete, as any  $k$ -sized solution of SB-MWIS need not satisfy the weight constraint in the  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS problem. However, when we use an algorithm  $\mathbb{B}$  for  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS in our algorithm, we could have simply used an algorithm for MWIS. Though this will not result in a size bound of  $s$  on the size of an independent set of weight at least  $\eta$  that we found, however, this is sufficient to solve P-CFFA, not SB-P-CFFA though. However, we need to use  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS, when MWIS is NP-complete and we wish to use FPT algorithm with respect to  $k$ . Due to Theorem 17 and this observation, P-CFFA is FPT when parameterized by  $n+s$  for several graph classes, such as chordal graphs [17], bipartite graphs [17],  $P_6$ -free graphs [18], outerstring graph [23], and fork-free graph [25].

► **Remark 19.** Our algorithm for chordal graphs is an improvement over the known algorithm that runs in  $\mathcal{O}(m^{n+2}(Q+1)^{2n})$  time, where  $Q = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} p_a(i)$  [7].

Next, we prove Theorem 4.

► **Theorem 4.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be an  $f$ -independence friendly class. Then, there exists an algorithm for  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS running in time  $\mathcal{O}((f^{-1}(k))^k \cdot (n+m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ , and hence an algorithm for  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-P-CFFA running in time  $2^{\mathcal{O}(ns)} \cdot (f^{-1}(s))^s \cdot (m + \log(\eta))^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$*

**Proof.** Let  $(G, k, \rho, w)$  be a given instance of  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS. Further,  $\mathcal{G}$  is  $f$ -ifc. Let  $\text{HighWeight} = \{v \in V(G) : w(v) \geq \rho/k\}$ . Note that if there exists an independent set of  $G[\text{HighWeight}]$  of size  $k$ , then it is the solution of our problem. Since,  $G$  belongs to  $f$ -ifc,  $G[\text{HighWeight}]$  is also  $f$ -ifc. Thus, there exists an independent set in  $G[\text{HighWeight}]$  of size at least  $f(|\text{HighWeight}|)$ . If  $f(|\text{HighWeight}|) \geq k$ , then there exists a desired solution in  $G[\text{HighWeight}]$ . To find a solution, we do as follows. Consider an arbitrary set  $X \subseteq \text{HighWeight}$  of size  $f^{-1}(k)$ . The size of  $X$  guarantees that the set  $X$  also has a desired solution. Now we enumerate subsets of size  $k$  of  $X$  one by one, and check whether it is independent; and if independent return it. This concludes the proof. Otherwise,  $|\text{HighWeight}| < f^{-1}(k)$ . Note that the solution contains at least one vertex of  $\text{HighWeight}$ . Thus, we guess a vertex, say  $v$ , in the set  $\text{HighWeight}$  which is in the solution, delete  $v$  and its neighbors from  $G$ , and decrease  $k$  by 1. Repeat the algorithm on the instance  $(G - N[v], k-1, \rho - w(v), w|_{V(G-N[v])})$ .

Since the number of guesses at any step of the algorithm is at most  $f^{-1}(k)$  and the algorithm repeats at most  $k$  times, the running time of the algorithm is  $\mathcal{O}((f^{-1}(k))^k \cdot (n+m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ . ◀



Hence we have the following corollary.

► **Corollary 20.** *There exists an algorithm that solves  $\mathcal{G}$ -SB-MWIS in  $\mathcal{O}((2k)^k \cdot (n+m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ ,  $\mathcal{O}((4k^2)^k \cdot (n+m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ ,  $\mathcal{O}((4k)^k \cdot (n+m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ ,  $\mathcal{O}((dk+k)^k \cdot (n+m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ ,  $\mathcal{O}(R(\ell, k)^k \cdot (n+m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$  time, when  $\mathcal{G}$  is a family of bipartite graphs, triangle free graphs, planar graphs,  $d$ -degenerate graphs, graphs excluding  $K_\ell$  as an induced graphs, respectively. Here,  $R(\ell, k)$  is an upper bound on Ramsey number.*

## 5 Proof of Theorem 5

► **Theorem 5.** *All the variants of the CFFA problem, when restricted to the case where the conflict graph  $\mathcal{H}$  on  $m$  vertices has at least  $\binom{m}{2} - t$  many edges admits*

1. *an algorithm running in time  $2^{\mathcal{O}(n \cdot \sqrt{t} \cdot \log(t))} \cdot (m + \log(\eta))^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ ; and*
2. *an algorithm running in time  $2^{\mathcal{O}(t \cdot \log(t))} \cdot (m + \log(\eta))^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ .*

**Proof.**

1. Subexponential time algorithm when the number of agents is constant.

The algorithm is based on counting the independent sets of size at least two and then mapping them to the agents. Thus, the algorithm works for all three variants of CFFA. Hence, for convenience, we write CFFA in this proof.

We first observe that the complement graph of  $\mathcal{H}$ , denoted by  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$ , contains all the vertices of  $\mathcal{H}$  but  $t$  edges only. Moreover, each clique in this graph constitutes a conflict-free bundle in the instance of CFFA. Conversely, we claim that any conflict-free bundle in the instance of CFFA must form a clique in  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$  since for every pair of jobs  $x_1, x_2$  in a bundle, there exists an edge in  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$ .

Thus, enumerating all possible cliques (not just maximal ones) in  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$  allows us to check for possible allocations to agents. To show that this is doable in the claimed time, we will count the number of cliques in  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$ . Since  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$  has  $t$  edges, there can be at most  $2t$  vertices that are not isolated. Vertices that are isolated *constitute a clique of size 1*, and are called *trivial cliques*. They are upper bounded by the number of jobs ( $m$ ), and will be counted separately. A clique is said to be *non-trivial* if it does not contain an isolated vertex. Next, we will upper bound the non-trivial cliques. Towards this, we first show that  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$  is a  $2\sqrt{t}$ -degenerate graph by a simple counting argument. Note that if there exists a subgraph  $H$  with minimum degree at least  $2\sqrt{t}$ , then the graph must have more than  $t$  edges. Let  $H$  be the subgraph of  $\mathcal{H}$  induced on the non-isolated vertices of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Since  $H$  has at most  $t$  edges, every subgraph of  $H$  has a vertex of degree at most  $2\sqrt{t}$ . Thus,  $H$  is a  $2\sqrt{t}$ -degenerate graph, and hence has a  $2\sqrt{t}$ -degeneracy sequence.

Let  $\mathcal{D} = v_1, \dots, v_{2t}$  denote a  $2\sqrt{t}$ -degenerate degree sequence of  $H$ . Notice that for any  $i \in [2t]$ ,  $v_i$  has at most  $2\sqrt{t}$  neighbors among  $\{v_j : j > i\}$ . Consider the  $2\sqrt{t}$  neighbors of  $v_1$  and among them there can be at most  $2^{2\sqrt{t}}$  cliques and can be enumerated in time  $\mathcal{O}(2^{2\sqrt{t}})$ . By iterating over  $v_i$ , we can enumerate all the non-trivial cliques in  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$  in  $\mathcal{O}(2t \cdot 2^{2\sqrt{t}})$  time. Indeed, for a non-trivial clique  $C$ , if  $v_i$  is the first vertex in  $C$  with respect to  $\mathcal{D}$ , that is all other vertices in  $C$  appear after  $v_i$  in  $\mathcal{D}$ , then  $C$  is enumerated when we enumerate all the cliques with respect to  $v_i$  in our process. This implies that the number of independent sets in  $\mathcal{H}$  is upper bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(2t \cdot 2^{2\sqrt{t}} + m)$  and the number of independent sets of size at least 2 in  $\mathcal{H}$  is upper bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(2t \cdot 2^{2\sqrt{t}})$ . Let  $\mathbb{I}_{\geq 2}$  denote the family of independent sets of  $\mathcal{H}$  that have size at least 2 – the family of non-trivial independent sets.

Thus, one potential algorithm is as follows. We first guess which agents are assigned non-trivial independent sets and which independent set. That is, for each agent  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , we guess an independent set  $I_a \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 2} \cup \gamma$  ( $\gamma$  is just to capture that the agent will not get non-trivial bundle). Let  $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  be the set of agents for whom the guess is not  $\gamma$ . Let  $(\mathcal{A}', \{I_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}'})$  denote the corresponding guess for the agents in  $\mathcal{A}'$ . We first check that the guess for  $\mathcal{A}'$  is *correct*. Towards that we check that for each  $a_1, a_2 \in \mathcal{A}'$ ,  $I_{a_1} \cap I_{a_2} = \emptyset$  and for each  $a \in \mathcal{A}'$ , we have that  $\sum_{i \in I_a} \text{ut}_a(i) \geq \eta$ . For the complete variant, we additionally need to check that  $\cup_{a \in \mathcal{A}'} I_a$  is the set of all non-isolated vertices in  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$ . Since,  $|\mathbb{I}_{\geq 2}|$  is upper bounded by  $\mathcal{O}(2t \cdot 2^{2\sqrt{t}})$ , the number of guess are upper bounded by  $\mathcal{O}((2t \cdot 2^{2\sqrt{t}} + 1)^n)$ . For each correct guess  $(\mathcal{A}', \{I_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}'})$ , we solve the remaining problem in polynomial time by invoking the algorithm for SB-P-CFFA or SB-C-CFFA for  $s = 1$  in Theorem 1, depending on whether we are solving complete variant or partial. Let  $\mathcal{A}^* = \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}'$ ,  $\mathcal{I}^* = \mathcal{I} \setminus (\cup_{a \in \mathcal{A}'} I_a)$ , and  $s = 1$ . Then, we apply Theorem 1 on the following instance:  $(\mathcal{A}^*, \mathcal{I}^*, (\text{ut}_i)_{a_i \in \mathcal{A}^*}, \mathcal{H}[\mathcal{I}^*], s, \eta)$ , here  $\mathcal{H}[\mathcal{I}^*]$  is a clique. This implies that the total running time of the algorithm is upper bounded by  $\mathcal{O}((2t \cdot 2^{2\sqrt{t}} + 1)^n (n + m)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ .

## 2. An FPT algorithm with respect to $t$ .

Since this algorithm also works for all three variants of CFFA, we write CFFA in this proof, for convenience.

Let  $\mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}, \eta)$  be a given instance of CFFA. Let  $V_{>1}$  be the set of vertices which are part of independent sets of size at least 2. As argued for the subexponential algorithm,  $|V_{>1}| \leq 2t$ . Thus, there are at most  $t$  bundles that contains more than one job. We guess partition of the jobs in  $V_{>1}$  into at most  $t + 1$  sets,  $\text{notLarge}, \text{Large}_1, \dots, \text{Large}_\ell$ , where  $\ell \leq t$ , such that each set is an independent set in  $\mathcal{H}$ . The set  $\text{notLarge}$  might be empty. This contains the set of jobs in  $V_{>1}$  which will not be part of any bundle of size at least 2. The size of  $\text{Large}_j$  is at least 2, for every  $j \in [\ell]$ , and each  $\text{Large}_j$  will be assigned to distinct agents in the solution (the size should be adjusted for size-bounded variant). Next, we construct a complete graph  $\mathcal{H}'$  as follows. For each  $\text{Large}_j$ , where  $j \in [\ell]$ , we have a vertex  $\text{Large}_j$  in  $\mathcal{H}'$ , and  $\text{ut}'_i(\text{Large}_j) = \sum_{x \in \text{Large}_j} \text{ut}_i(x)$ , where  $i \in [n]$ . If a vertex  $v \in \mathcal{H}$  does not belong to any  $\text{Large}_j$ , where  $j \in [\ell]$ , then add the vertex  $v$  to  $\mathcal{H}'$ , and  $\text{ut}'_i(v) = \text{ut}_i(v)$ , where  $i \in [n]$ . Let  $\mathcal{J}' = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}'_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}', \eta)$  be the new instance of CFFA where  $\mathcal{H}'$  is a complete graph. We again invoke the polynomial time algorithm for SB-P-CFFA or SB-C-CFFA for  $s = 1$  in Theorem 1, depending on whether we are solving complete variant or partial, on the instance  $\mathcal{J}'$  with  $s = 1$ , and return the “yes”, if the solution exists. If the algorithm does not find the assignment for any guessed partition, then we return “no”. The running time follows from Theorem 1 and the fact that there are at most  $(2t)^{t+1}$  possible partitions.

Next, we prove the correctness of the algorithm. Suppose that  $\mathcal{J}$  is a yes-instance of CFFA and  $\phi$  be one of its solution. Let  $\mathcal{B} = \{\phi^{-1}(a) : a \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } |\phi^{-1}(a)| \geq 2\}$ . Clearly, sets in  $\mathcal{B}$  are disjoint subsets of  $V_{>1}$ . Let  $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \dots, B_\ell\}$ . Let  $X \subseteq V_{>1}$  contains all the jobs that do not belong to any set in  $\mathcal{B}$ . Since we try all possible partitions of  $V_{>1}$ , we also tried  $B_1, \dots, B_\ell, X$ . Without loss of generality, let  $B_i$  is assigned to  $a_i$  under  $\phi$ . Thus, in the graph  $\mathcal{H}'$ , there is a matching  $M = \{a_i B_i \in i \in [\ell]\} \cup \{a \phi^{-1}(a) : |\phi^{-1}(a)| = 1\}$  that saturates  $\mathcal{A}$  in the proof of Theorem 1 for  $s = 1$ . Thus, the algorithm returns “yes”. The correctness of the other direction follows from the correctness of Theorem 1 for  $s = 1$  case and the construction of the instance  $\mathcal{J}'$ .  $\blacktriangleleft$

## 6 Proof of Theorem 6

► **Theorem 6.** *All the variants of CFFA, when restricted to the case where the conflict graph  $\mathcal{H}$  is a union of  $q$  cliques*

1. *is solvable in polynomial time when  $q = 2$  and utility functions are uniform, i.e., the utility functions are the same for all the agents; and*
2. *is NP-hard when  $q = 2$  and  $\eta = 3$  (but utility function is not uniform).*

**Proof.**

1. Polynomial time algorithm.

**For the partial variant.** We first present the algorithm for partial variant. Note that here  $s \leq 2$ . Theorem 1 consider the case  $s = 1$ . Thus, here we can assume that  $s = 2$ . Hence, P-CFFA and SB-P-CFFA variants are same in this case.

Let  $\mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}, \eta)$  be a given instance of P-CFFA. Since the utility functions are uniform, we skip the agent identification from the subscript of utility function, i.e., instead of writing  $\text{ut}_i$  for the utility function of agent  $a_i$ , we will only use  $\text{ut}$ .

We note that if there exists a job  $z$  such that  $\text{ut}(z) \geq \eta$ , then there exists a solution that assign it to some agent. Since the utility functions are uniform, it can be assigned to any agent. Let  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$  be the set of jobs whose utility is at least  $\eta$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}} = \{z \in \mathcal{I} : \text{ut}(z) \geq \eta\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{LowUtility}} = \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}$ . If  $|\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}| \geq n$ , then every agent get an job from the set  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}$ , and it is a solution. Otherwise, there are  $|\mathcal{A}| - |\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}|$  agents to whom we need to assign bundles of size two. Let  $\text{IS}$  denote the set of all independent sets of size two in  $\mathcal{H}[\mathcal{I}_{\text{LowUtility}}]$ . Thus,  $\text{IS}$  has size at most  $m^2$ .

Next, we construct a graph, denoted by  $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ , on the jobs in  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{LowUtility}}$  where there is an edge between vertices  $a$  and  $b$  if  $\{a, b\} \in \text{IS}$  and  $u(a) + u(b) \geq \eta$ . In this graph we compute a maximum sized matching, denoted by  $\mathcal{M}$ . If its size is less than  $n - |\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}|$ , then we return the answer “no”. Otherwise, we return answer “yes” and create an assignment as follows: if  $(a, b) \in \mathcal{M}$ , then we have a bundle containing  $\{a, b\}$ . We create exactly  $n - |\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}|$  such bundles of size two and discard the others. These bundles along with the singleton bundles from  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}$  yield our assignment for  $n$  agents.

Clearly, this graph has  $m$  vertices and at most  $m^2$  edges. Thus, the maximum matching can be found in polynomial time. Next, we prove the correctness of the algorithm.

**Correctness:** If the algorithm returns an assignment of jobs to the agents, then clearly, for every agent the utility from the bundle is at least  $\eta$ . Every bundle is also an independent set in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Moreover, if a bundle is of size one, then the singleton job is clearly an element of the set  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}$ ; otherwise, the bundle represents an independent set of size two in  $\text{IS}$  whose total utility is at least  $\eta$ . There are  $n$  bundles in total, exactly  $|\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}|$  bundles of size one and at least  $n - |\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}|$  bundles of size two.

In the other direction, suppose that  $\phi$  is a solution to  $\mathcal{J}$ . Let  $a$  be an agent whose bundle size is two and  $\phi^{-1}(a)$  contains at least one job from  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}$ , say  $z$ . Update the assignment  $\phi$  as follows:  $\phi^{-1}(a) = \{z\}$ . Note that  $\phi$  is still a solution to  $\mathcal{J}$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  be the set of agents such that for every agent  $a \in \mathcal{A}_1$ ,  $|\phi^{-1}(a)| = 1$ , i.e., the bundle size assigned to every agent in  $\mathcal{A}_1$  is 1. Clearly,  $\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_1) \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}$ . Let  $\text{rem} = \mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}} \setminus \phi^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_1)$ , the set of unassigned “high value” jobs. Suppose that  $\text{rem} \neq \emptyset$ .

Let  $\mathcal{A}'' \subseteq \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_1$  be a set of size  $\min\{|\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_1|, |\text{rem}|\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}'' = \{a_1, \dots, a_\ell\}$  and  $\text{rem} = \{z_1, \dots, z_q\}$ , where clearly  $\ell \leq q$ . Update the assignment  $\phi$  as follows: for every  $i \in [\ell]$ ,

$\phi(z_i) = \{a_i\}$ . Clearly,  $\phi$  is still a solution of  $\mathcal{J}$ . We note that there are only two cases: either  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}''$  or  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A} \setminus (\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}'')$  is non-empty.

If  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}''$ , then we have that the disjoint union of  $\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_1) \cup \phi^{-1}(\mathcal{A}'') \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}$ . In other words,  $|\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}| \geq n$ , and so there exists a solution in which every bundle is of size one and contains an element from  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}$ .

Otherwise, let  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A} \setminus (\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}'')$ . Clearly, each of the jobs in  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}$  are assigned to agents in  $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}''$  and subsets of jobs in  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{LowUtility}}$  are assigned to agents in  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ . In other words, there exist  $|\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}|$  bundles of size one and  $n - |\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}|$  bundles of size two. Specifically for the latter, we know that each of the bundles is an independent set, they are pairwise disjoint, and the total utility within each bundle is at least  $\eta$ . Thus, the members of each bundle share an edge in the graph  $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$  and the bundles themselves form a matching in the graph. Thus, our algorithm that computes a maximum matching in  $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$  would find a matching of size at least  $n - |\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}|$ . Hence, given the construction of the assignment from such a matching, we can conclude that our algorithm would return an assignment with the desired properties.

**For the complete variant.** Note that the value of  $s = 2$  as argued above. Thus, C-CFFA and SB-C-CFFA variants are the same.

Let  $\mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}, \eta)$  be a given instance of C-CFFA, where  $\mathcal{H}$  is a cluster graph with two cliques, and the utility functions are uniform. Let  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  be two cliques in  $\mathcal{H}$ . The definitions of  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{LowUtility}}$  are same as defined earlier. We first guess the number of items  $\ell_1 = |\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}} \cap C_1|$  and  $\ell_2 = |\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}} \cap C_2|$  that are assigned as singletons in a solution. Next, we construct an auxiliary graph  $\hat{H}$  as follows: the vertex set of  $\hat{H}$  contains all the items in  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{LowUtility}}$ , any  $|\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}| - \ell_1$  items from the set  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}} \cap C_1$ , and any  $|\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}| - \ell_2$  items from the set  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}} \cap C_2$ ; for any two items  $x \in C_1$  and  $y \in C_2$ ,  $xy$  is an edge if  $\text{ut}(x) + \text{ut}(y) \geq \eta$ . We find a perfect matching  $M$  in  $\hat{H}$  in polynomial time. If  $\ell_1 + \ell_2 + |M| = n$ , we return “yes”. If the algorithm does not return “yes” for choice of  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_2$ , then we return “no”.

**Correctness:** Note that if we return “yes”, then clearly, it’s a yes-instance of the problem as we can assign pair of matched items to any  $|M|$  agents,  $\ell_1$  items from  $(\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}} \cap C_1) \setminus V(\hat{H})$  and  $\ell_2$  items from  $(\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}} \cap C_2) \setminus V(\hat{H})$ . Clearly, all the constraints are satisfied. For the other direction, suppose that  $\mathcal{J}$  is a yes-instance of C-CFFA, and let  $\phi: \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  be one of its solution. Let  $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  be the set of agents that are assigned single item. Clearly,  $\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{A}') \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}$ . Let  $\ell_1 = |\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{A}') \cap C_1|$  and  $\ell_2 = |\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{A}') \cap C_2|$ . Note that all the items in  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{HighUtility}}$  are identical in the sense that they can be assigned to any agent as singleton and achieve the target value. Clearly, we guessed these  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_2$  as well. Note that every agent in  $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}'$ . Thus, the auxiliary graph  $\hat{H}$  constructed for these two choices of  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_2$  has a perfect matching of size  $|\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}'|$ , hence we return “yes”.

Next, we prove the hardness result.

## 2. NP-hardness

The proof is similar to the NP-hardness proof in Theorem 1 for the size bounded variant. The only difference is the construction of the conflict graph  $\mathcal{H}$ . Here, we add edges between all the jobs corresponding to every element in  $X$  and  $D$ . Furthermore, we add edges between all the jobs corresponding to every element in  $Y$ . Thus, it is a cluster graph with two cliques. The rest of the construction and the proof is the same.  $\blacktriangleleft$

## 7 Proof of Theorem 7

► **Theorem 7.** *Both P-CFFA and C-CFFA have the following properties:*

1. *have a polynomial-sized kernel of size  $\tau\eta n^2$ , where  $\tau$  denotes the neighborhood diversity of the conflict graph;*
2. *have a polynomial-sized kernel of size  $d\eta n^2$  if  $d < n$ , where  $d$  is the maximum degree of the conflict graph; and*
3. *do not have a polynomial-sized kernel when parameterized by  $\text{tw} + n$  unless  $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP} \setminus \text{poly}$ , where  $\text{tw}$  be the treewidth of the conflict graph. Moreover, the same result holds even for  $\text{tw} + \eta + n$  on C-CFFA.*

**Proof.**

1. Graphs of bounded neighborhood diversity.

First, we focus initially on the C-CFFA problem and present a polynomial kernel. Subsequently, we make slight adjustments to our marking procedure to achieve the same outcome for the P-CFFA problem. To begin, we reaffirm the definition of *neighborhood diversity* within our specific context. Given a graph, we say two vertices  $u, v$  are of the same type if  $N(v) \setminus \{u\} = N(u) \setminus \{v\}$ . Consider  $\tau$  as the number of types of vertices (also known as the neighborhood diversity) in the conflict graph  $G$ , with vertex groups  $V_1 \uplus V_2 \uplus \dots \uplus V_\tau$ . Leveraging the intrinsic characteristic of neighborhood diversity, each group  $V_i$ , where  $i \in [\tau]$ , is either a clique or constitutes an independent set. Moreover, for any pair  $i, j \in [\tau]$  where  $i \neq j$ , either every vertex in  $V_i$  is adjacent to each vertex in  $V_j$  or none of them are adjacent. Observe that if there exists a clique of size at least  $n + 1$  in the conflict graph, then the provided instance of C-CFFA is a no-instance. Consequently, we proceed with the assumption that each  $V_i$  that forms a clique has a size of at most  $n$ . Without loss of generality let the groups  $V_i$ s where  $i \in [\tau']$  constitutes independent sets and each of the remaining groups constitutes a clique. Let  $V' = \bigcup_{i=\tau'+1}^{\tau} V_i$  be the set of vertices of the cliques. Building upon this, we implement the subsequent marking scheme that aids us in constraining the number of vertices within each group  $V_i$  that constitutes an independent set (as opposed to a clique).

- For a group  $V_i$  where  $i \in [\tau']$ , initialize  $B_i(j) = \emptyset, \forall j \in [n]$ .
- For an arbitrary vertex  $v \in V_i$ , if there exists  $j \in [n]$ , such that  $\text{ut}_j(v) > 0$  and  $|B_i(j)| < \eta n$ , include  $v$  into  $B_i(j)$ .
- Delete  $v$ , if  $v$  is not included in any  $B_i(j)$ , where  $i \in [\tau']$  and  $j \in [n]$ .

Following the marking procedure, the size of any bag  $B_i(j), i \in [\tau']$  and  $j \in [n]$  is bounded by  $\eta n$ . Therefore, the number of remaining vertices in each group  $V_i$  is at most  $\eta n^2$ .

▷ **Claim 21.**  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{a_i \in \mathcal{A}}, \mathcal{H}, \eta)$  is a yes-instance if and only if  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}[V^*], \eta)$  is a yes-instance, where  $V^* = V' \bigcup_{i \in [t], j \in [n]} B_i(j)$ .

*Proof:* In the forward direction, let's consider a yes-instance  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}, \eta)$  of C-CFFA accompanied by a solution  $\mathcal{S}'$ . This solution encapsulates a *minimal* set denoted as  $\mathcal{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_n)$ , in which each  $S_i$  is assigned to the agent  $a_i$  and  $\sum_{v \in S_i} \text{ut}_i(v) \geq \eta$ . In our context, a set is classified as *minimal* if it has no proper subset that is *minimal*.

Next, we construct an assignment completely contained in  $V^*$  where each agent receives an independent set and has its utility requirement of  $\eta$  satisfied. If the assignment  $\mathcal{S}_{V^*} = (S_1 \cap V^*, \dots, S_n \cap V^*)$ , where each  $S_i \cap V^*$  is allocated to agent  $a_i$ , does not meet the utility requirements, then there exists an index  $i \in [n]$  such that  $\sum_{v \in S_i \cap V^*} \text{ut}_i(v) < \eta$ . Independence

is not a concern as  $S_i \cap V^*$  induces an independent set. However, in such a scenario there exists a (deleted) vertex  $v \in (S_i \cap B_j) \setminus V^*$ , where  $B_j = \mathcal{S} \cap V_j$ . This implies that  $\eta n$  many vertices from  $B_j$  were already marked in the marking scheme (with positive utilities) for agent  $a_i$ . Among these vertices, at most  $(n-1)\eta$  may be allocated to other agents within the minimal solution. Hence within  $(V_j \cap V^*) \setminus \bigcup_{l \in [n], l \neq i} S_l$ , there are at least  $\eta$  vertices that have positive utility values for agent  $a_i$  and are not assigned to any other agents in  $\mathcal{S}$ . We construct an alternate solution by assigning all these vertices to agent  $a_i$ , thereby fulfilling its utility requirement of  $\eta$ . Employing this procedure exhaustively leads to an assignment with all assigned vertices in  $V^*$  where each agent receives an independent set and has its utility requirement of  $\eta$  satisfied. This implies  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}[V^*], \eta)$  is indeed a yes-instance.

The converse direction is straightforward to establish. Let  $\mathcal{S}^* = (S_1, \dots, S_n)$  represent a solution to  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}[V^*], \eta)$ . Considering that there must exist an agent that is assigned a vertex from  $V_j \cap V^*$ , we can extend the solution  $\mathcal{S}'$  to a solution for  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}, \eta)$  by assigning all the additional vertices from  $V_j$  to the respective agent. This confirms the correctness of the reduction.  $\diamond$

Thus, we obtain a polynomial kernel when the conflict graph has a bounded neighborhood diversity. It's important to observe that for P-CFFA we can not bound the size of the maximum clique by  $n$  using the same argument. However, we can attain a comparable bound as follows. In each clique, for every agent, we retain/mark  $n^2$  vertices with the highest utility values corresponding to the agent. And following this marking scheme we discard the remaining vertices. The correctness of this marking procedure is evident from the fact that any agent can pick at most one vertex from such a clique and since all vertices are of the same type, it prefers/chooses to pick one with utility value as large as possible. This marking procedure (for groups that are cliques), combined with the marking procedure (for groups that induce independent sets) for the C-CFFA problem, produces a kernel of the same asymptotic size  $(\tau\eta n^2)$  for the P-CFFA problem.

## 2. Graphs of bounded degree ( $d < n$ ).

Now, we provide a kernel for the P-CFFA where the maximum degree of the conflict graph is less than  $n$ . Subsequently, we show that the same kernelization algorithm can be extended to the C-CFFA problem. Towards that let  $d$  be the maximum degree of the graph  $G$ . We proceed by describing the following marking procedure.

- For each agent  $a_i$ , initialize  $B_i = \emptyset, \forall i \in [n]$ .
- For an arbitrary vertex  $v \in V$ , if there exists  $i \in [n]$ , such that  $\text{ut}_i(v) > 0$  and  $|B_i| < d\eta n$ , include  $v$  into  $B_i$ .
- Delete  $v$ , if  $v$  is not included in any  $B_i$  where  $i \in [n]$ .

We reiterate that the input instance of P-CFFA problem is denoted by  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}, \eta)$ . Let  $V^* = \bigcup_{i \in [n]} B_i$ . Below, we claim  $V^*$  to be our desired kernel.

$\triangleright$  **Claim 22.**  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}, \eta)$  is a yes-instance if and only if  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}[V^*], \eta)$  is a yes-instance.

*Proof:* In the forward direction let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}, \eta)$  be a yes-instance. The key observation used here is, a graph with  $m$  vertices and bounded degree  $d$ , has an independent set of size at least  $\lfloor \frac{m}{d} \rfloor$ . Since for each agent  $a_i$ , we mark  $d\eta n$  many vertices (each with a positive utility for  $a_i$ ), there is an independent set of size at least  $\eta n$  among such marked vertices. Moreover, in any minimal solution, one agent is assigned at most  $\eta$  many vertices (from such an independent set). Thus from such an independent set, at most  $(n-1)\eta$  vertices

are assigned to agents other than  $a_i$ . Hence we may assign at least  $\eta$  many vertices (who are also independent) to agent  $a_i$  with positive utilities, satisfying the utility requirement. Note that the aforementioned arguments hold true for all the other agents as well. Therefore  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\mathbf{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}[V^*], \eta)$  is indeed a yes-instance.

The reverse direction follows from the fact that  $V^* \subseteq V$ . Any satisfying assignment for P-CFFA on a subgraph remains a satisfying assignment on the original graph.  $\diamond$

When we focus on the C-CFFA problem, it's important to note that we can bound the size of a maximum clique by  $n$  for a yes-instance. And, the implication of  $d < n$  from it is used to design a kernel for the C-CFFA by making use of the marking procedure described above. Let  $\mathcal{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_n)$  be any solution for the instance  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\mathbf{ut}_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}, \mathcal{H}, \eta)$  of P-CFFA. Consider any vertex  $v$  that was either deleted during the marking procedure ( $v \in V \setminus V^*$ ) or belongs to  $V^* \setminus \mathcal{S}$ . Since  $\deg(v) < n$ , there must exist a set  $S_i$  that does not contain any neighbors of  $v$ . Hence we can assign  $v$  to agent  $a_i$ , thus expanding the earlier solution by including  $v$  into it, i.e.,  $\mathcal{S}' = (S_1, \dots, S_i \cup \{v\}, \dots, S_n)$  for the instance  $(G[V^* \cup \{v\}], n, \eta, \widehat{s} + 1, \{\mathbf{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]})$ . An exhaustive application of this expansion procedure results in a solution for the instance  $(G, n, \eta, m, \{\mathbf{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]})$  of C-CFFA. Hence we have a kernel of size  $d\eta n^2$  for both the version of the problem.

### 3. Graphs of bounded treewidth.

Due to [22], there is no polynomial kernel for the SB-MWIS problem when parameterized by vertex cover (vc). P-CFFA problem is essentially the SB-MWIS when  $k = 1$ , Hence P-CFFA problem does not admit a polynomial kernel when parameterized by  $\text{vc} + n$  and also for the parameter  $\text{tw} + n$ . Moreover, note that  $k$ -COLORING has no polynomial kernel parameterized by the combined parameter  $\text{tw} + n$ , as there are straight-forward *AND-cross-compositions* from the problem to itself [10]. Consequently, the same conclusion extends to the C-CFFA problem even for parameter  $\text{tw} + \eta(= 0) + n$   $\blacktriangleleft$

## 8 Proof of Theorem 8

### ► Theorem 8.

1. If  $d > n$ , P-CFFA has a polynomial-sized kernel of size  $d\eta n^2$ , where  $d$  denotes the maximum degree of the conflict graph. However, C-CFFA becomes NP-hard even when  $d + \eta + n$  is a constant.
2. P-CFFA admits polynomial-sized kernel of size  $\chi\eta n^2$  and  $\mathcal{O}(n(r + \eta n)^r)$ , where  $\chi$  is the chromatic number, and  $r$  is the size of the maximum clique in the conflict graph. Contrastingly, C-CFFA remains NP-hard for even constant values of  $\chi + r + \eta + n$ .

**Proof.** This theorem discusses the contrast of results between the partial version of the problem with the complete version. We first consider P-CFFA and provide kernels for respective parameters and then show the impossibility results for C-CFFA.

1. Graphs of maximum degree  $d > n$ .

Observe that in proof of Theorem 7, we have not used the restriction on the maximum degree to get the kernel for the P-CFFA. Thus the same result holds true in this case as well. However, Observation 24 refutes any possibility of getting a kernel for the C-CFFA problem.

2. Graphs of bounded chromatic number ( $\chi$ ) and excluding large cliques ( $K_r$ ).

We employ a marking scheme similar to that used for graphs with bounded degree (see Section 7). Let  $\mathcal{H}_\chi$  denote the collection of graphs with a chromatic number not exceeding  $\chi$ . The crucial insight is that any set of  $\chi \cdot b$  vertices inherently encompasses an independent set with a size of at least  $b$ . Building upon this pivotal observation, we establish the subsequent marking procedure.

- For each agent  $a_i$ , initialize  $B_i = \emptyset, \forall i \in [n]$ .
- For an arbitrary vertex  $v \in V$ , if there exists  $i \in [n]$ , such that  $\text{ut}_i(v) > 0$  and  $|B_i| < \chi\eta n$ , include  $v$  into  $B_i$ .
- Delete  $v$ , if  $v$  is not included in any  $B_i$  where  $i \in [n]$ .

The safeness of the marking procedure follows in a manner analogous to that of Lemma 22. However, a partial assignment may not be extendable to a complete one in this context.

When the conflict excludes large clique  $K_r$ , we use the *Ramsey's Theorem* as a pivotal tool to design the desired kernel.

► **Proposition 23.** *Any graph  $G$  of size  $R(r, r_i)$  contains either a clique of size  $r$  i.e.,  $K_r$  or an independent set of size  $r_i$  where  $R(r, r_i)$  is  $\mathcal{O}((r + r_i)^r)$ .*

As before, our goal is to select a sufficient number of vertices with positive utilities for each agent, ensuring that there's a subset of these vertices that forms an independent set of the size at least  $\eta n$ . Let  $\mathcal{H}_r$  be the family of graphs with no  $K_r$ . For each agent, we mark at most  $R(r, \eta n)$  vertices with positive utilities (corresponding to these agents) in the marking scheme. But  $G \in \mathcal{H}_r$ , of size  $R(r, \eta n)$  always contains an independent set of size least  $\eta n$ . Formally, the marking scheme is as follows.

- For each agent  $a_i$ , initialize  $B_i = \emptyset, \forall i \in [n]$ .
- For an arbitrary vertex  $v \in V$ , if there exists  $i \in [n]$ , such that  $\text{ut}_i(v) > 0$  and  $|B_i| < R(r, \eta n)$ , include  $v$  into  $B_i$ .
- Delete  $v$ , if  $v$  is not included in any  $B_i$  where  $i \in [n]$ .

The safeness of the marking procedure can be reasoned in a manner similar to the explanation provided in the proof of Claim 22.

**NP-hardness.** Now, we consider the C-CFFA problem and provide a reduction from 3-COLORING on 4-regular planar graph to C-CFFA. Note that finding the exact chromatic number of a 4-regular planar graph (which is 4-colorable and  $K_5$ -free) is NP-hard [12]. Given an instance of 3-COLORING on planar graphs, we can reduce it to an equivalent instance  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}, \{\text{ut}_i\}_{i \in [n]}, \mathcal{H}, \eta)$  of C-CFFA, where  $|\mathcal{A}| = 3, \mathcal{I} = V(G), \mathcal{H} = G, \eta = 1$ , and  $\text{ut}_i(x) = 1, \forall a_i \in \mathcal{A}, \forall x \in V(G)$ . Since the planar graph  $\mathcal{H}$  excludes  $K_5$ , has a bounded chromatic number and a bounded degree, we have the following observation.

► **Observation 24.** *C-CFFA is NP-hard even when  $n + \eta + \chi + r$  or  $n + \eta + d$  is a constant.*

It is easy to see that Observation 24 immediately eliminates the possibility of getting a kernel parameterized by  $n + \eta + \chi + r$ . ◀



## 9 Conclusion

In this article, we studied conflict-free fair allocation problem under the paradigm of parameterized complexity with respect to several natural input parameters. We hope that this will lead to a new set of results for the problem.

One natural direction of research is to consider various other fairness notions known in the literature, such as envy-freeness, proportional fair-share, min-max fair-share, etc., under the conflict constraint. Some of these fairness notions have already been studied under this constraint, but not from the viewpoint of parameterized complexity.

---

### References

- 1 M. M. Ahmadian, M. Khatami, A. Salehipour, and T. C. E. Cheng. Four decades of research on the open-shop scheduling problem to minimize the makespan. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 295(2):399–426, 2021.
- 2 N. Alon, R. Yuster, and U. Zwick. Color-coding. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 42(4):844–856, 1995.
- 3 S. Barman and P. Verma. Existence and computation of maximin fair allocations under matroid-rank valuations. In *AAMAS '21*, pages 169–177, 2021.
- 4 I. Bezáková and V. Dani. Allocating indivisible goods. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges*, 5(3):11–18, 2005.
- 5 Arpita Biswas, Yiduo Ke, Samir Khuller, and Quanquan C. Liu. An algorithmic approach to address course enrollment challenges. In *4th Symposium on Foundations of Responsible Computing, FORC 2023*, volume 256 of *LIPICs*, pages 8:1–8:23, 2023.
- 6 S. Cheng and Y. Mao. Restricted max-min allocation: Integrality gap and approximation algorithm. *Algorithmica*, pages 1–40, 2022.
- 7 N. Chiarelli, M. Krnc, M. Milanic, U. Pferschy, N. Pivac, and J. Schauer. Fair packing of independent sets. In *IWOCA 2020*, volume 12126 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 154–165, 2020.
- 8 M. Cygan, F. Fomin, L. Kowalik, D. Lokshtanov, D. Marx, M. Pilipczuk, M. Pilipczuk, and S. Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015.
- 9 M. Cygan and M. Pilipczuk. Exact and approximate bandwidth. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 411(40-42):3701–3713, 2010.
- 10 Marek Cygan, Fedor V Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized algorithms*, volume 5. Springer, 2015.
- 11 K. Dabrowski, V. V. Lozin, H. Müller, and D. Rautenbach. Parameterized complexity of the weighted independent set problem beyond graphs of bounded clique number. *J. Discrete Algorithms*, 14:207–213, 2012.
- 12 David P. Dailey. Uniqueness of colorability and colorability of planar 4-regular graphs are np-complete. *Discrete Mathematics*, 30(3):289–293, 1980. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0012365X80902368>, doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X\(80\)90236-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X(80)90236-8).
- 13 B. L. Deuermeyer, D. K. Friesen, and M. A. Langston. Scheduling to maximize the minimum processor finish time in a multiprocessor system. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 3(2):190–196, 1982.
- 14 S. Ebadian, D. Peters, and N. Shah. How to fairly allocate easy and difficult chores. In *AAMAS 2022*, pages 372–380. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (IFAAMAS), 2022.
- 15 F. V. Fomin, D. Lokshtanov, and S. Saurabh. Efficient computation of representative sets with applications in parameterized and exact algorithms. In *SODA*, pages 142–151, 2014.

- 16 M. R. Garey and David S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman, 1979.
- 17 Martin Charles Golumbic. *Algorithmic graph theory and perfect graphs*. 2004.
- 18 A. Grzesik, T. Klimošová, M. Pilipczuk, and Michał Pilipczuk. Polynomial-time algorithm for maximum weight independent set on  $p_6$ -free graphs. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 18(1), 2022. doi:10.1145/3414473.
- 19 Sushmita Gupta, Pallavi Jain, and Saket Saurabh. How to assign volunteers to tasks compatibly? A graph theoretic and parameterized approach. *CoRR*, abs/2309.04995, 2023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2309.04995>, arXiv:2309.04995, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2309.04995.
- 20 John E. Hopcroft and Richard M. Karp. An  $n^{5/2}$  algorithm for maximum matchings in bipartite graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 2(4):225–231, 1973. doi:10.1137/0202019.
- 21 H. Hummel and M. L. Hetland. Fair allocation of conflicting items. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 36(1):1–33, 2022.
- 22 Bart Jansen and Hans Bodlaender. Vertex cover kernelization revisited: Upper and lower bounds for a refined parameter. volume 53, pages 177–188, 03 2011. doi:10.1007/s00224-012-9393-4.
- 23 J. M. Keil, J. SB Mitchell, D. Pradhan, and M. Vatschelle. An algorithm for the maximum weight independent set problem on outerstring graphs. *Computational Geometry*, 60:19–25, 2017.
- 24 D. Kurokawa, A. D. Procaccia, and J. Wang. Fair enough: Guaranteeing approximate maximin shares. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 65(2):1–27, 2018.
- 25 Vadim V. Lozin and Martin Milanič. A polynomial algorithm to find an independent set of maximum weight in a fork-free graph. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms*, 6(4):595–604, 2008. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jda.2008.04.001>.
- 26 R. T. Moenck. Practical fast polynomial multiplication. In *Proceedings of SYMSAC'76*, pages 136–148, 1976.
- 27 M. Naor, L. J. Schulman, and A. Srinivasan. Splitters and near-optimal derandomization. In *Proceedings of IEEE 36th Annual Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 182–191, 1995.
- 28 W. Suksompong. Constraints in fair division. *SIGecom Exch.*, 19(2):46–61, 2021.
- 29 G. J. Woeginger. A polynomial-time approximation scheme for maximizing the minimum machine completion time. *Operations Research Letters*, 20(4):149–154, 1997.