

The Flow Game: Leximin and Leximax Core Imputations

Rohith R. Gangam¹, Naveen Garg², Parnian Shahkar¹, and Vijay V. Vazirani¹

¹University of California, Irvine

²Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

March 12, 2024

Abstract

Recently [Vaz24] gave mechanisms for finding leximin and leximax core imputations for the assignment game and remarked, “Within the area of algorithm design, the “right” technique for solving several types of algorithmic questions was first discovered in the context of matching and later these insights were applied to other problems. We expect a similar phenomenon here.” One of the games explicitly mentioned in this context was the flow game of Kalai and Zemel [KZ82].

In this paper, we give strongly polynomial time mechanisms for computing the leximin and leximax core imputations for the flow game, among the set of core imputations that are captured as optimal solutions to the dual LP. We address two versions:

1. The imputations are leximin and leximax with respect to the distance labels of edges.
2. The imputations are leximin and leximax with respect to the product of capacities of edges and their distance labels.

1 Introduction

Motivated by a need to find equitable core imputations for the assignment game, recently [Vaz24] gave mechanisms for finding leximin and leximax core imputations. These mechanisms run in strongly polynomial time and were obtained via a suitable adaptation of the classical primal-dual paradigm from combinatorial optimization. [Vaz24] further remarked, “Within the area of algorithm design, the “right” technique for solving several types of algorithmic questions was first discovered in the context of matching and later these insights were applied to other problems. We expect a similar phenomenon here.” One of the games explicitly mentioned in this context was the flow game of Kalai and Zemel [KZ82].

In this paper, we give strongly polynomial time mechanisms for computing the leximin and leximax core imputations for the flow game, among the set of core imputations that are captured as optimal solutions to the dual LP. We address two versions:

1. The imputations are leximin and leximax with respect to the distance labels of edges.
2. The imputations are leximin and leximax with respect to the product of capacities of edges and their distance labels.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce our formal model.

Definition 2.1. A cooperative game involves a set N of n players and a function c , where $c : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ assigns to each subset S of N a value $c(S)$, representing what that group can achieve on its own. The entire set N is known as the grand coalition.

Definition 2.2. An imputation is a way to distribute the total value $c(N)$ of the game among the players using a function $p : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. It ensures the sum of all individual shares $\sum_{i \in N} p(i)$ equals $c(N)$, with $p(i)$ being the share of player i .

Definition 2.3. We say that an imputation p belongs to the core of the game (N, c) if, for every possible coalition S within N , the aggregate allocation to members of S is no less than the value they could collectively produce, i.e., $\sum_{i \in S} p(i) \geq c(S)$.

2.1 Max-flow Game

Consider a directed graph $G = (V, E)$ with specific source s and sink t nodes, along with positive edge capacities $c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. A feasible flow $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ adheres to the following:

- Capacity constraint: The flow f_e through any edge e must not exceed its capacity c_e .
- Conservation of flow: For every vertex v except s and t , the inflow and outflow must be equal.

The flow value f is the sum of the flow leaving source s or entering sink t , which are equal due to flow conservation across other vertices. The goal of the maximum flow problem is to maximize this flow value within given constraints.

The max-flow game is defined over an instance of the maximum flow problem which consists a graph $G = (V, E)$, with two distinguished vertices, a source s and a sink t , and non-negative capacities, $c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. The edges constitute the players. The flow from s to t generates a profit that needs to be fairly distributed among these edge-players. The entire set of edges, E , forms the grand coalition, with its value, $worth(E)$, equating to G 's maximum flow value. For a subset of edges $S \subseteq E$, the graph $G(S) = (V, S)$, maintains the original vertices but only includes edges from S , with capacities restricted to S , denoted as $c : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. The value of such a subset, $worth(S)$, corresponds to the maximum flow in $G(S)$. The concepts of imputation and the core, as described in the preceding definitions, are applicable here as well.

Divide the vertex set V of the graph into two distinct subsets, X and \bar{X} , ensuring s is in X and t resides in \bar{X} . The collection of edges leading from X to \bar{X} constitutes an s-t cut, represented by (X, \bar{X}) , with its capacity being the aggregate of the capacities for these edges. It's evident that the capacity of any s-t cut sets a limit on the magnitude of a viable flow. Thus, if we encounter an s-t cut, for instance, (X, \bar{X}) , whose capacity matches the magnitude of a feasible flow f , then (X, \bar{X}) is identified as the minimal s-t cut within G , and correspondingly, f is the maximal flow through G . The well-known Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem validates the feasibility of achieving such an equivalence between a flow and an s-t cut.

To frame the maximum flow problem within a linear programming paradigm, we initially incorporate an edge with unlimited capacity from t to s , ensuring flow conservation at both s and t , thereby transforming the scenario into a circulation problem. The aim is to maximize the flow f_{ts} across this added edge to achieve maximum flow in the original graph. We assign the primal variable f_{ij} to quantify the flow through each edge $(i, j) \in E$. The linear program for the maximum flow problem is outlined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{maximize} && f_{ts} \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{(j,i) \in E} f_{ji} - \sum_{(i,j) \in E} f_{ij} \leq 0 \quad \forall i \in V, \\
& && f_{ij} \leq c_{ij} \quad \forall (i, j) \in E, \\
& && f_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall (i, j) \in E
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The initial inequalities ensure that at each node i , the incoming flow does not surpass the outgoing flow. Although this setup does not strictly enforce equal incoming and outgoing flows to form a standard maximization linear program, the principle of equality is nonetheless guaranteed as discussed in [Vaz23].

Definition 2.4. An edge $(i, j) \in E$ is classified as essential if it is utilized to its full capacity in all maximum flow solutions.

We proceed by defining dual variables π_i for node potentials and δ_{ij} for the capacity constraints in the edges, leading to the dual linear program formulation.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && \sum_{(i,j) \in E} c_{ij} \delta_{ij} \\
& \text{subject to} && \delta_{ij} - \pi_i + \pi_j \geq 0 \quad \forall (i, j) \in E, \\
& && \pi_s - \pi_t \geq 1, \\
& && \delta_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall (i, j) \in E, \\
& && \pi_i \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in V
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Considering δ_{ij} and π_i as labels for edge distances and vertex potentials respectively simplifies understanding their application. Suppose, for a given graph instance G , the dual linear program yields an *integral* optimal solution. In such a case, it's straightforward that each variable in the solution is either 0 or 1, as they need not surpass 1. Consequently, π_s would be 1, π_t would be 0, and the potentials for other vertices would also be either 0 or 1.

The distance labels in any optimal dual solution are conceptualized as a *fractional s-t cut*, with its *capacity* determined by the sum of the product of edge capacities and their corresponding δ_{ij} values, that is, $\sum_{(i,j) \in E} c_{ij} \delta_{ij}$. According to the LP-Duality Theorem, this capacity equates to the maximum flow value.

Given an optimal dual solution (δ, π) , the LP-duality theorem stipulates that the game's total value corresponds to the objective value of this solution, expressed as:

$$\text{worth}(E) = \sum_{(i,j) \in E} c_{ij} \cdot \delta_{ij}.$$

Define the *profit* of edge (i, j) to be

$$p(i, j) := c_{ij} \cdot \delta_{ij}.$$

[Vaz23] showed that for any max-flow game, the dual partially characterizes its core and core imputations corresponding to optimal dual solutions allocate all the profits to essential players only. [FZCD02] showed that in general, checking whether an imputation is in the core is NP-hard. Therefore our focus is finding a fair core imputation among the imputations that are obtained from optimal solutions of the dual LP 2. This class of core imputations are defined as dual-consistent core imputations.

Definition 2.5. A max flow core imputation p is **dual-consistent** if there exists an optimal solution (δ, π) for the dual LP 2, where profit of each edge (i, j) can be written as $p(i, j) = c_{ij} \cdot \delta_{ij}$.

Not all core imputations are dual-consistent. Next, we will provide an example of a core imputation that does not correspond to any optimal solution of dual LP 2.

Example 2.6. Suppose $G = (V, E)$ is the following directed graph with four nodes $s, a, b,$ and t . The arrows between the nodes represent directed edges, and the numbers above the edges represent the capacity associated with each edge. The value of maximum flow from s to t is 10, which can be distributed evenly among the four edges. The resulting imputation is a core imputation. Suppose this imputation corresponds to an optimal solution of the dual LP 2 (δ, π) . Given that the profit of each edge is 2.5 units, where $p(i, j) = c_{ij} \cdot \delta_{ij}$, distance labels of all the edges are uniquely determined as $\delta_{sb} = 1/2, \delta_{bt} = 1/4, \delta_{sa} = 1/2,$ and $\delta_{ab} = 1/2, .$ Observe that for any optimal solution of the dual LP 2, $\pi_s = 1, \pi_t = 0,$ and all constraints of the form $\delta_{ij} - \pi_i + \pi_j \geq 0$ are tight. Therefore constraints corresponding to the edges $\{sb\}$ and $\{bt\}$ imply that $\delta_{sb} = 1 - \pi_b,$ and $\delta_{bt} = \pi_b.$ Given the distance labels $\delta_{sb} = 1/2$ and $\delta_{bt} = 1/4,$ no value of π_b satisfies both constraints of edges $\{sb\}$ and $\{bt\}$. Hence, no optimal solution of the dual LP 2 can characterize the core imputation in which all edges receive 2.5 units of profit.




Figure 1: Example 2.6

Definition 2.7. For each dual-consistent core imputation of the max flow game $G = (V, E), c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+,$ sort the allocations made to edges in increasing order. Given two sorted lists L1 and L2, L1 is considered lexicographically larger than L2 if, at the first position where they diverge, the element in L1 exceeds that in L2; this discrepancy could involve the profits of distinct players. An imputation resulting in the lexicographically greatest sequence is termed a **leximin** dual-consistent core imputation.

Definition 2.8. For each dual-consistent core imputation of the max flow game $G = (V, E), c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+,$ sort the allocations made to edges in decreasing order. Consider two sorted lists, L1 and L2. L1 is deemed lexicographically smaller than L2 if, at the initial point of divergence between the two lists, the entry in L1 is less than that in L2. An imputation that produces the lexicographically smallest list is designated as a **leximax** dual-consistent core imputation.

In [PQ80], authors gave a characterization of all minimum cuts, separating a source from a sink in a graph. They also give a procedure to enumerate all integral minimum cuts in the graph. Given this procedure, a natural approach for finding a leximin dual-consistent core imputation is to find the linear combination of integral min-cuts that results in a leximin fractional min-cut. However since the number of integral min-cuts in a graph can be exponential, this procedure must take exponential time in total, in the worst case. Nevertheless, Picard-Queyranne graph is the main backbone of our algorithm that finds the leximin dual-consistent core imputation in polynomial time. Therefore, we will precisely describe the procedure for finding the Picard-Queyranne graph, in short G_{PQ} , of a max flow game.

Definition 2.9. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, and a flow f , the *residual graph* G_R is defined as follows: For each edge (i, j) in the original graph G with capacity $c(i, j)$ and flow $f(i, j)$, we introduce a forward edge in G_R with a residual capacity $c_R(i, j) = c(i, j) - f(i, j)$ and a backward edge with a residual capacity $c_R(j, i) = f(i, j)$. Finally we remove all forward and backward edges with zero residual capacity.

Definition 2.10. *Strongly connected components* (SCCs) of a directed graph are maximal subgraphs where there exists a directed path between all pairs of vertices.

Graphs are decomposed into SCCs using algorithms like Tarjan’s or Kosaraju’s, which systematically explore edges to identify cycles and thereby delineate components.

Algorithm 1

- 1: **Input:** $G = (V, E)$, $s \in V, t \in V$, $c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$.
 - 2: Find max-flow f .
 - 3: $G_R \leftarrow$ residual graph of $G = (V, E)$ given flow f
 - 4: $V_{PQ} \leftarrow SCC(G_R)$
 - 5: $E_{PQ} \leftarrow$ Connections between SCCs
 - 6: Construct graph $G_{PQ} = (V_{PQ}, E_{PQ})$
 - 7: **Output:** G_{PQ} .
-

Algorithm Description: The algorithm takes as input a max flow instance $G = (V, E)$, with two distinguished vertices, a source s and a sink t , and non-negative capacities, $c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. Then it finds a maximum flow f , and a residual graph G_R according to f . Then it condenses each SCC of the graph G_R into a single vertex to form a set V_{PQ} of representative vertices. Finally, it constructs a new graph $G_{PQ} = (V_{PQ}, E_{PQ})$ with vertices V_{PQ} and directed edges E_{PQ} , where each edge in E_{PQ} represents a connection between SCCs in the original graph, maintaining the original edge direction and capacity in the residual graph G_R .

Let $S : V \rightarrow V_{PQ}$ be the function that takes a vertex in G and returns a vertex corresponding to its SCC in G_{PQ} . Let $T : V_{PQ} \rightarrow 2^V$ be the function that takes a vertex in G_{PQ} and returns the set vertices of G , in the SCC it represents. Let’s call $S(s)$ and $S(t)$ the PQ-source and PQ-sink respectively. Also, note that edges of PQ structure are directed the other way compared to the original graph.

E_{PQ} constitutes only a subset of edges in the residual graph G_R , and since there is no $s - t$ path in G_R , no $s - t$ path exists in G_{PQ} either. Each vertex in V_{PQ} represents a set of vertices in

G , and due to the flow conservation principle upheld at every vertex (excluding s and t) in G , this property is similarly maintained for any vertex in $V_{PQ} \setminus \{S(s), S(t)\}$.

By definition, any essential edge (i, j) in graph G is fully utilized in every maximum flow. Therefore, in the residual graph G_R , only the backward edge from j to i with capacity $c_R(j, i) = c_{ij}$ remains, as the forward edge from i to j was removed. This results in vertex i not being reachable from j , ensuring that these vertices do not reside in the same SCC. Thus, all essential edges of G are preserved in E_{PQ} , albeit with reversed direction and unchanged capacity. Conversely, both endpoints of any non-essential edge (i, j) are mutually reachable, implying they are within the same SCC, leading to the exclusion of non-essential edges from E_{PQ} . Hence, only the essential edges of the original graph are preserved in G_{PQ} . Given that all minimum cuts of G comprise subsets of essential edges, and considering the preservation of these edges in G_{PQ} , there exists a one-to-one correspondence between the minimum cuts in G_{PQ} and those in G . The preservation of only essential edges in G_{PQ} , coupled with the invariant nature of corresponding edges in G_R across all maximum flows f , ensures the uniqueness of G_{PQ} for any given G .

3 Results

First, we define the notion of “dual-consistent” potentials on vertices and explain its relation to the core imputations given by the dual of the max-flow game.

Definition 3.1. A potential function $\bar{\pi} : V_{PQ} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ on the vertices of the Picard-Queyranne structure is said to be “dual-consistent” if

1. Potential of the vertex corresponding to the source is 1, i.e., $\bar{\pi}(S(s)) = 1$
2. Potential of the vertex corresponding to the sink is 0, i.e., $\bar{\pi}(S(t)) = 0$
3. Potential on every (directed) edge is non-decreasing, i.e., $\forall (i, j) \in E_{PQ}, \bar{\pi}(i) \leq \bar{\pi}(j)$

Lemma 3.2. *Each dual-consistent potential $\bar{\pi}$ defines a unique fractional min-cut of graph G .*

Proof. We will first construct a fractional cut $\mathcal{C}_{PQ}(\bar{\pi})$ of the graph G_{PQ} from $\bar{\pi}$. By taking the corresponding edges of G with equal weights, we get a fractional min-cut, $\mathcal{C}(\bar{\pi})$ of G .

List the vertices of V_{PQ} in a non-increasing order of potentials, starting with $S(s)$, ending with $S(t)$ and breaking ties arbitrarily. Let this list be $L = \{v_1 = S(s), v_2, v_3, \dots, v_n = S(t)\}$, where $n = |V_{PQ}|$. We will create a fractional cut that is a convex combination of cuts, each of which breaks this list into two parts.

Define the first cut \mathcal{S}_1 to be the set of all edges directed into the PQ-source, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{S}_1 = \{e = (i, j) \in E_{PQ}, s.t. j = v_1 = S(s)\}$$

Note that this corresponds a min-cut of G . We will define new cuts iteratively by “pulling vertices” across previous cuts. With each pull of a vertex v_k , update \mathcal{S}_{k-1} by removing all the edges going out of v_k and add all edges coming into $v_k, k \in \{2, 3, \dots, n-1\}$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{S}_k = \{\mathcal{S}_{k-1} \setminus \{e = (i, j) \in E_{PQ}, s.t. i = v_k\}\} \cup \{e = (i, j) \in E_{PQ}, s.t. j = v_k\}$$

Note that, for every vertex other than the source and the sink, the sum of capacities of all incoming edges is equal to the sum of all outgoing edges. This ensures that each \mathcal{S}_k corresponds to a min-cut of G . Define $\mathcal{C}_{PQ}(\bar{\pi})$ as a convex combination of the above cuts as follows.

$$\mathcal{C}_{PQ}(\bar{\pi}) = (\bar{\pi}(v_1) - \bar{\pi}(v_2)) * (\mathcal{S}_1) + (\bar{\pi}(v_2) - \bar{\pi}(v_3)) * (\mathcal{S}_2) + \dots + (\bar{\pi}(v_{k-1}) - \bar{\pi}(v_k)) * (\mathcal{S}_{k-1})$$

The sum of all weights in $\mathcal{C}_{PQ}(\bar{\pi})$ add up to $\bar{\pi}(v_1) - \bar{\pi}(v_k) = \bar{\pi}(S(s)) - \bar{\pi}(S(t)) = 1$. So, \mathcal{C}_{PQ} is a fractional cut of the graph G_{PQ} and by taking the corresponding edges in G with equal weights, we get a fractional min-cut, $\mathcal{C}(\bar{\pi})$, of the graph G . And, while the list L was created by breaking ties arbitrarily, the cut $\mathcal{C}_{PQ}(\bar{\pi})$ itself has been created using successive differences of potentials, which would become zero in case of ties. Hence, it is as if we are pulling all the vertices with equal potentials together across the cuts. The uniqueness of the cut follows. And so, every dual consistent potential defines a unique fractional min-cut. \square

Lemma 3.3. *A dual-consistent potential $\bar{\pi}$ defines a unique imputation of the max-flow game in graph G .*

Proof. Define the profit of each edge $(i, j) \in E$ using the potentials of the corresponding vertices in G_{PQ} as $p_{ij} = c_{ij} * \delta_{ij}$ where $\delta_{ij} = (\bar{\pi}(S(i)) - \bar{\pi}(S(j)))$. The total profit distributed by this imputation is just the value of the fractional min-cut $\mathcal{C}(\bar{\pi})$, which in turn is the max-flow and the worth of graph G . \square

Lemma 3.4. *The imputation defined by a dual-consistent potential $\bar{\pi}$ is in the core of the max-flow game of graph G .*

Proof. As above, define $\delta_{ij} = (\bar{\pi}_{S(i)} - \bar{\pi}_{S(j)})$, $\forall (i, j) \in E$. Define potentials on π on vertices in V as the potential assigned to corresponding vertices in V_{PQ} , i.e., $\forall v \in V, \pi_v = \bar{\pi}(S(v))$. It can be seen that δ together with π is a feasible solution to the dual LP?? of the graph. It is also an optimal solution as it distributes the worth of a fractional min-cut. The lemma follows from Theorem ??, which states that every dual-optimal imputation is in core. \square

The above lemma is the reason why we call the potential function “dual-consistent”. The potentials arising from this function are consistent with the dual LP of the graph. This also changes the problem’s perspective in a key way. Before, we were to compute an optimal assignment of profits to the *edges in G* . Now, we can find the optimal potentials on *vertices of G_{PQ}* , and construct profits of the edges as above.

3.1 Finding Leximin and Leximax dual-consistent core imputations in the flow game

We provide an intuition of algorithm 2 which computes the leximin core imputation. It first constructs the PQ-structure(G_{PQ}) of a graph G - this preserves only the essential edges of the graph which are the only edges getting profits in dual-consistent core imputations. Then it recursively assigns potentials to the vertices, in a greedy way, as follows. First, it assigns potentials of 1 and 0 for the PQ-source($S(s)$) and PQ-sink($S(t)$) respectively. Let’s call the vertices with assigned and unassigned potentials ”Fixed vertices” and ”Free vertices” and represent them as F and R respectively. Call a path from one fixed vertex to another fixed vertex that traverses only through free vertices as ”Free paths”. Among all free paths, the algorithm finds the one that can give highest

leximin profits on this path. That is, among all these paths, it tries to assign potentials in such a way that each of the edges gets the same profit. Then it chooses the one with the least profit. Note that, if this path wasn't chosen, any other assignment of potentials on this path would only give a lesser cost to some edge, meaning the assignment is "lexi-worse". It recursively finds such paths until all the vertices are given potentials and then computes the profits of edges. Algorithm 3 works in the same way - it chooses the free path that maximizes the average profits assigned. Algorithms 4 and 5 treat all edge capacities as equal and so, just look at the length of the paths.

Algorithm 2 Leximin dual-consistent core imputation, for profits, in max-flow game

- 1: **Input:** A max flow game on graph $G(V, E)$, with source s and a sink t , and non-negative capacities, $c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_+$.
 - 2: Compute the Picard-Queyranne structure, G_{PQ} , of the graph G
 - 3: Assign potentials(π) of 1 and 0 to the source and sink of G_{PQ}
 - 4: **while** There is a free vertex **do**
 - 5: Find a free path $P = \arg \min_{P=[a, \dots, b] \in \text{Free paths}} \frac{\pi_b - \pi_a}{\sum_{e \in P} \frac{1}{c_e}}$
 - 6: Assign potentials(π) on P such that all edges get equal profits
 - 7: Update free and fixed vertices
 - 8: **end while**
 - 9: For all edges $(i, j) \in E'$, set profit $_{ij} = c_{ij}(\pi_j - \pi_i)$
 - 10: **Output:** The Leximin dual-consistent core imputation.
-

Algorithm 3 Leximax dual-consistent core imputation, for profits, in max-flow game

- 1: **Input:** A max flow game on graph $G(V, E)$, with source s and a sink t , and non-negative capacities, $c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_+$.
 - 2: Compute the Picard-Queyranne structure, G_{PQ} , of the graph G
 - 3: Assign potentials(π) of 1 and 0 to the source and sink of G_{PQ}
 - 4: **while** There is a free vertex **do**
 - 5: Find a free path $P = \arg \max_{P=[a, \dots, b] \in \text{Free paths}} \frac{\pi_b - \pi_a}{\sum_{e \in P} \frac{1}{c_e}}$
 - 6: Assign potentials(π) on P such that all edges get equal profits
 - 7: Update free and fixed vertices
 - 8: **end while**
 - 9: For all edges $(i, j) \in E'$, set profit $_{ij} = c_{ij}(\pi_j - \pi_i)$
 - 10: **Output:** The Leximax dual-consistent core imputation.
-

Algorithm 4 Leximin dual-consistent core imputation, for distance labels, in max-flow game

- 1: **Input:** A max flow game on graph $G(V, E)$, with source s and a sink t , and non-negative capacities, $c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_+$.
 - 2: Compute the Picard-Queyranne structure, G_{PQ} , of the graph G
 - 3: Assign potentials(π) of 1 and 0 to the source and sink of G_{PQ}
 - 4: **while** There is a free vertex **do**
 - 5: Find a free path $P = \arg \min_{P=[a, \dots, b] \in \text{Free paths}} \frac{\pi_b - \pi_a}{\text{length of } P}$
 - 6: Assign potentials(π) on P such that all edges get equal profits
 - 7: Update free and fixed vertices
 - 8: **end while**
 - 9: For all edges $(i, j) \in E'$, set profit $_{ij} = c_{ij}(\pi_j - \pi_i)$
 - 10: **Output:** The Leximin dual-consistent core imputation.
-

Algorithm 5 Leximax dual-consistent core imputation, for distance labels, in max-flow game

- 1: **Input:** A max flow game on graph $G(V, E)$, with source s and a sink t , and non-negative capacities, $c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_+$.
 - 2: Compute the Picard-Queyranne structure, G_{PQ} , of the graph G
 - 3: Assign potentials(π) of 1 and 0 to the source and sink of G_{PQ}
 - 4: **while** There is a free vertex **do**
 - 5: Find a free path $P = \arg \max_{P=[a, \dots, b] \in \text{Free paths}} \frac{\pi_b - \pi_a}{\text{length of } P}$
 - 6: Assign potentials(π) on P such that all edges get equal profits
 - 7: Update free and fixed vertices
 - 8: **end while**
 - 9: For all edges $(i, j) \in E'$, set profit $_{ij} = c_{ij}(\pi_j - \pi_i)$
 - 10: **Output:** The Leximax dual-consistent core imputation.
-

Theorem 3.5. *For a max flow game on a graph G , algorithms 2 and 3 compute the leximin and leximax imputations over profits among all dual-consistent core imputations and algorithms 4 and 5 compute the leximin and leximax imputations over distance labels among all dual-consistent core imputations in polynomial time.*

Proof. We only argue about the correctness and efficiency of algorithm 2. The workings of algorithms 3, 4 and 5 are similar.

In algorithm 2, finding the free path with least $\frac{\pi_b - \pi_a}{\sum_{e \in P} \frac{1}{c_e}}$ is the same as finding the free path with highest $\frac{\sum_{e \in P} \frac{1}{c_e}}{\pi_b - \pi_a}$. This can be done in polynomial time by considering a new graph with inverted edge lengths, finding the longest path, $P_{i,j}$ with length $l_{i,j}$, between every pair (i, j) of fixed vertices in the new graph, and choosing the one with highest $\frac{l_{i,j}}{\pi_j - \pi_i}$. Since the longest path in a directed acyclic graph can be computed efficiently, the algorithm can be executed in polynomial time.

Verifying that the assigned potentials are dual-consistent is trivial - a violating edge $e = (i, j)$ with $\pi_i - \pi_j < 0$ would imply a better free path when i was being assigned its potential. To show that the final imputation is leximin, consider the profit of edges in the order we choose the paths. Every time we choose a path and assign potentials, we assign the minimum average profits

possible on this path to all the edges. If one of these edges gets a higher profit, some other edge on the path should get a lower profit implying the allocation is lexicographically worse. And so, the optimal allocation should assign the same profits to these edges and hence, the same potentials on the vertices. The proof that the resulting imputation is leximin among dual-consistent core imputations follows by induction. \square

References

- [FZCD02] Qizhi Fang, Shanfeng Zhu, Maocheng Cai, and Xiaotie Deng. On computational complexity of membership test in flow games and linear production games. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 31:39–45, 2002.
- [KZ82] Ehud Kalai and Eitan Zemel. Totally balanced games and games of flow. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 7(3):476–478, 1982.
- [PQ80] Jean-Claude Picard and Maurice Queyranne. *On the structure of all minimum cuts in a network and applications*, pages 8–16. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1980.
- [Vaz23] Vijay V. Vazirani. LP-Duality theory and the cores of games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07627*, 2023.
- [Vaz24] Vijay V Vazirani. The assignment game: New mechanisms for equitable core imputations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11437*, 2024.