

Mechanism Design for Locating Facilities with Capacities with Insufficient Resources[†]

Gennaro Auricchio^{1*}, Harry J. Clough² and Jie Zhang²

¹Department of Mathematics, Università di Padova, Padua, Italy.

²Department of Computer Science, University of Bath, Bath, UK.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): gennaro.auricchio@unipd.it;
Contributing authors: hc2405@bath.ac.uk; jz2558@bath.ac.uk;

Abstract

This paper explores the Mechanism Design aspects of the m -Capacitated Facility Location Problem where the total facility capacity is less than the number of agents. Following the framework outlined in [2], the Social Welfare of the facility location is determined through a First-Come-First-Served (FCFS) game, in which agents compete once the facility positions are established. When the number of facilities is $m > 1$, the Nash Equilibrium (NE) of the FCFS game is not unique, making the utility of the agents and the concept of truthfulness unclear. To tackle these issues, we consider absolutely truthful mechanisms—mechanisms that prevent agents from misreporting regardless of the strategies used during the FCFS game. We combine this stricter truthfulness requirement with the notion of Equilibrium Stable (ES) mechanisms, which are mechanisms whose Social Welfare does not depend on the NE of the FCFS game. We demonstrate that the class of percentile mechanisms is absolutely truthful and identify the conditions under which they are ES. We also show that the approximation ratio of each ES percentile mechanism is bounded and determine its value. Notably, when all the facilities have the same capacity and the number of agents is sufficiently large, it is possible to achieve an approximation ratio smaller than $1 + \frac{1}{2m-1}$. Finally, we extend our study to encompass higher-dimensional problems. Within this framework, we demonstrate that the class of ES percentile mechanisms is even more restricted and characterize the mechanisms that are both ES and absolutely truthful. We further support our findings by empirically evaluating the performance of the mechanisms when the agents are the samples of a distribution.

Keywords: Facility Location, Mechanism Design, Game Theory, Nash Equilibrium

[†]A previous version of this paper appeared in the proceedings of UAI24, [1]. In this improved version, we study the problem in higher dimension and enhance our numerical results.

1 Introduction

The m -Capacitated Facility Location Problem (m -CFLP) extends the m -Facility Location Problem (m -FLP) by introducing a constraint that bounds the number of clients the facility can accommodate [3–5]. Both the m -FLP and the m -CFLP are essential subproblems in various applications within social choice theory. These include areas such as disaster relief [6], where efficient allocation of resources is of critical importance; supply chain management [7], which focuses on optimizing logistics and distribution networks; healthcare systems [8], aiming to improve service delivery and accessibility; clustering techniques [9, 10], used in data analysis and machine learning; and public facility accessibility [11], which enhances community services by effectively placing facilities to serve the population. In its fundamental guise, the m -CFLP consists of determining the location of m facilities starting from the positions of n agents. Each facility has a capacity limit, which describes the maximum amount of agents it can serve. While the algorithmic aspects of this problem have been extensively studied in the literature (see [3]), the mechanism design aspects of the problem have only recently started to garner the attention of the scientific community. In mechanism design, the Facility Location Problem and the m -CFLP are studied under the assumption that each agent incurs a cost to access the facilities. This cost is usually equal to the distance between the agent and the nearest facility. Consequently, every agent prefers to have a facility located as close to them as possible. In this case, if each agent is in charge of reporting its own position on the line, optimizing a communal goal is subject to manipulation driven by the agents’ self-interested behaviour. For this reason, a key property that a mechanism should possess is *truthfulness*, which ensures that no agent can gain an advantage by misrepresenting their private information. This stringent property, however, forces the mechanism to produce suboptimal locations, leading to an efficiency loss which is quantified by the *approximation ratio* – that is the worst-case ratio between the objective achieved by the mechanism and the optimal objective attainable [12]. Defining efficient routines that forbid agents from manipulating is the defining issue of mechanism design.

In this paper, we study the mechanism design aspects of the m -CFLP. In particular, we focus on the framework presented in [2], and extend it to the case in which we have m facilities whose total capacity is lower than the number of agents needing accommodation. In this framework, the mechanism designer cannot force agents to use a specific facility, therefore the agents compete in a First-Come-First-Served (FCFS) game to determine who is accommodated by the facilities. The overall process therefore consists of two parts. First, the agents report their position to a mechanism, which locates the facilities. Second, the agents compete in the FCFS game to determine their utilities. Notice that the Social Welfare achieved by the mechanism and the utilities of the agents depend on the Nash Equilibria (NE) of the FCFS game induced by the facilities’ placements. When we need to place a single facility, that is $m = 1$, the FCFS game has always a unique NE. When $m \geq 2$, however, the NE of the FCFS game is no longer unique, posing a series of challenges: if the NE is not unique, the agents’ utilities and thus the Social Welfare achieved by a facility placement have different values depending on the equilibrium of the FCFS game. As a consequence, the

approximation ratio also depends on the specific NE. Furthermore, the classic definition of the truthful mechanism is no longer suitable for this problem as it does not consider the different strategies that the agents may adopt during the FCFS game. Addressing these issues are a major challenge for this problem, and thus they were left as an open problem in [2].

A previous version of this paper appeared in the proceedings of UAI 2024. In this improved version, we fully characterize the set of feasible percentile mechanisms by studying the All-In-One and Side-By-Side mechanism and extend our study to higher dimensional problems. Furthermore, we enhance our numerical results by adding new metrics to study how well the best percentile mechanisms perform when the agents are assumed to be sampled from a probability distribution.

Our Contribution

In this paper, we study the mechanism design aspects of the m -CFLP when the total capacity of the facilities is less than the number of agents. In particular, we extend the framework presented in [2] to encompass problems in which there is more than one capacitated facility to locate. First, we show that, regardless of how we locate the facilities, the FCFS game induced by the location has at least one pure NE. We then present a notion of truthfulness that accounts for the different strategies the agents can adopt during the FCFS game, which we name *absolute truthfulness*. Finally, we introduce the class of Equilibrium Stable (ES) mechanisms, i.e. mechanisms whose output induces a FCFS game in which every NE achieves the same Social Welfare. Within this framework, we study the percentile mechanisms [13]. We show that every percentile mechanism is absolutely truthful and then fully characterize the set of conditions under which a percentile mechanism is ES and compute its approximation ratio.

First, we consider the case $m = 2$ and show that an absolutely truthful and ES percentile mechanism exists. In particular, we show that there are three categories of ES percentile mechanisms: (i) the All-In-One (AIO) mechanisms, which place all the facilities at the same position, i.e. $y_1 = y_2 = x_i$; (ii) the Side-By-Side (SBS) mechanisms, which places all the facilities at two consecutive agents' positions, i.e. $y_1 = x_i$ and $y_2 = x_{i+1}$; and (iii) the Wide-Gap (WG) mechanisms, which places the facilities at two well-separated positions, i.e. $y_1 = x_i$ and $y_2 = x_j$ where $i + 1 < j$. We then characterize the approximation ratio of a percentile mechanism as a function of the facilities' capacities and the vector inducing the percentile mechanism. Consequentially, we determine the best percentile mechanism tailored to the number of agents n and the capacities of the facilities k_1 and k_2 . We show that the best approximation ratio that an ES percentile mechanism placing two facilities can achieve is $\frac{4}{3}$, which occurs when $k_1 = k_2 = k$ and $n \geq 3k$. We then consider the case in which $m > 2$. In this framework, a percentile mechanism that is ES and places the facilities at more than two different locations might not exist. However, when all the facilities have the same capacity and $n \geq (2k - 1)m$ holds, there exists a percentile mechanism whose approximation ratio is less than $1 + \frac{1}{m-1}$. This result has two interesting consequences: (i) it shows that, under suitable assumptions, the percentile mechanisms are asymptotically optimal with respect to m and (ii) it highlights the differences between the

m -CFLP and the m -FLP. Indeed, in the classic framework, any percentile mechanism has unbounded approximation ratio whenever $m > 2$, [14, 15]. We then extend our study to higher-dimensional problems. We demonstrate that when agents are supported in a space that has two or more dimensions, the set ES percentile mechanisms becomes even more restricted. Specifically, a percentile mechanism is ES if and only if it places all the facilities at the same location or distributes all the facilities between two different points. Despite their differences, the worst-case analysis of these two types of percentile mechanisms yield similar worst-case guarantees.

Lastly, we empirically study the behaviour of the best percentile mechanisms under the assumption that the agents are distributed according to a distribution μ . We focus on the case in which we have two facilities, since it is the case in which the gap between 1 and the approximation ratio of the best possible percentile mechanism is largest. We conduct our analysis using two different metrics: the *Bayesian approximation ratio*, which compares the expected cost of the mechanism and the expected optimal cost [16] and the *average-case ratio*, which measures the average ratio between the mechanism cost and the optimal cost [17]. From our analysis, we observe that, regardless of the metric, when the agents follow a distribution, the performances of the ES mechanism are close to optimal, regardless of the distribution.

Related Work

The Mechanism Design aspects of the m -FLP were firstly studied in [18], where the authors studied the problem of placing a set of facilities amongst n self-interested agents who want to a facility located as close as possible to their real position. In this pioneering work, the authors studied the problem of placing a facility that minimizes the sum of all the agents costs. Following this seminal work, various mechanisms with constant approximation ratios for placing one or two facilities on lines [19], trees [20, 21], circles [22, 23], general graphs [24, 25], and metric spaces [26, 27] were introduced. Crucially, all these positive results are limited to scenarios where the number of agents is restricted or the number of facilities is either 1 or 2 and the objective is to minimize the total agents costs. For a comprehensive survey of the mechanism design aspects of the FLP, we refer to [28].

The m -Capacitated Facility Location Problem (m -CFLP) is a variation of the m -FLP in which each facility has a capacity limit. The first game theoretical framework for the m -CFLP was presented in [29]. In this paper, the authors studied the case in which there are at least two facilities whose total capacity is enough to accommodate all the agents and the mechanism designer has to decide where to place the facilities and which agent can use them, so that the mechanism must elicit the positions and the agent-to-facility matching. Following this initial study, in [30] the authors proposed a more theoretical analysis of the problem, while in [31] it was shown that it is possible to define deterministic mechanisms with bounded approximation ratio when all the facilities have the same capacities and the number of agents is equal to the total capacities of the facilities. Lastly, the m -CFLP has been studied from a Bayesian mechanism design perspective in [32].

In this paper, we consider an alternative game theoretical framework for the m -CFLP, firstly introduced in [2]. This framework differs from the one proposed in [29]

for two main reasons: (i) the total capacity of the facilities is lower than the total number of agents, thus part of the agents cannot be accommodated and (ii) the mechanism designer does not enforce an agent-to-facility assignment. Thus, after the positions of the facilities are elicited, the agents compete in a First-Come-First-Served (FCFS) game to access the facilities. When $m = 1$, the FCFS game is trivial as the agents accommodated by the facility are the ones that are closer to the facility. When $m > 1$, designing mechanisms becomes much more complicated as, for example, the Nash Equilibrium (NE) of the FCFS game is no longer unique. As a consequence the utility of every agent depends on the specific NE of the game, making the classic notion of trustfulness unfit for this framework.

2 Setting Statement

Let $\vec{x} \in [0, 1]^n$ be the position of n agents in the interval $[0, 1]$. We denote with $\vec{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_m)$ the m -dimensional vector containing all the capacities of the m facilities, so that k_j is the maximum number of agents that the j -th facility can accommodate. We assume that the total capacity of the facilities is less than the number of agents, hence $\sum_{j \in [m]} k_j < n$. In this case, a mechanism is a function $M : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ that maps a vector containing the agents' reports to a facility location $\vec{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$, where y_j is the position of the facility with capacity k_j . After the mechanism places the facilities, agents compete in a First-Come-First-Served (FCFS) game to access the facilities.

2.1 First-Come-First-Served Game

Let $\vec{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$ be a vector containing the position of the facilities to locate, that is the facility with capacity k_j is located at y_j . In what follows, we implicitly assume that there is an internal ordering of the agents to break ties. Then, given $\vec{x} \in [0, 1]^n$ the vector containing the positions of the n agents on the interval $[0, 1]$, the FCFS game induced by the facility location \vec{y} is as follows:

- (i) Each agent selects one of the facilities, so that the set of strategies of each agent is the set $[m] := \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. We denote with $\vec{s} \in [m]^n$ the vector containing a set of pure strategies. For every \vec{s} , we denote with $\mathcal{S}_j \subset [n]$ the set of agents that selected strategy j .
- (ii) Denoted with $d_{i,j} = |x_i - y_j|$ the distance of the agent i from the location of the facility they selected, we define $T_j \subset \mathcal{S}_j$ as the set containing the agents in \mathcal{S}_j whose value $d_{i,j}$ is in among the k_j lowest values. Break ties according to the prefixed priority rule.
- (iii) Finally, the utility of agent i is defined as follows

$$u_i(\vec{x}, \vec{y}; \vec{s}) = \begin{cases} 1 - |x_i - y_j| & \text{if } i \in T_j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

First, we show that every FCFS game has at least one pure Nash Equilibrium (NE).

Theorem 1 For every $\vec{x} \in [0, 1]^n$, every $\vec{y} \in [0, 1]^m$, and every capacity vector \vec{k} , the FCFS game associated with \vec{x} , \vec{y} , and \vec{k} admits at least one pure Nash Equilibrium.

Proof Let \vec{x} be the vector containing the position of the agents and let \vec{y} be the position of the facilities. We denote with k_j the capacity of the facility located at y_j for every $j \in [m]$. In what follows, we assume that the set of agents has an inner ordering that decides how to break ties. Let us define \mathcal{D} the set containing all the distances agents to facility, that is $\mathcal{D} = \{|x_i - y_j|\}_{i \in [n], j \in [m]}$.

Let $\vec{c}, \vec{s} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be two null vectors, that is $c_j = s_j = 0$ for every $j \in [m]$. We now construct a Nash Equilibrium through the following iterative routine.

1. Let d be the minimum of the elements in \mathcal{D} . Up to a tie, there exist a couple $(i_1, j_1) \in [n] \times [m]$ such that $d = |x_{i_1} - y_{j_1}|$. We set $c_{j_1} = c_{j_1} + 1$, $s_{i_1} = j_1$, and remove all the elements of the form $|x_{i_1} - y_j|$ from \mathcal{D} . Then, if $c_{j_1} = k_{j_1}$, we remove from \mathcal{D} all the elements of the form $|x_i - y_{j_1}|$.
2. We repeat the routine of point (1) until \mathcal{D} becomes empty.
3. If $s_i = 0$ for some $i \in [n]$, we set them to be equal to 1.

Since \mathcal{D} is discrete, the routine terminates in finite number of iterations and the output is a vector containing a set of agents' pure strategies.

We now show that the output of the routine \vec{s} is a Nash Equilibrium by proving that no agent i can increase its utility by deviating from playing s_i . Toward a contradiction, assume that an agent i can increase its utility by playing s'_i rather than s_i . By definition of s_i , we have that if $|x_i - y_{s'_i}| < |x_i - y_{s_i}|$, then there are at least $k_{s'_i}$ agents that are closer to $y_{s'_i}$ or that have a higher priority order than agent i and play strategy s'_i . Thus the agent cannot gain a benefit from deviating from s_i , which proves that \vec{s} is a pure Nash Equilibrium. \square

When the vector \vec{k} is clear from the context, we denote the set of all the pure Nash Equilibria with $NE(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$. The Social Welfare (SW) of the facility location \vec{y} according to $\gamma \in NE(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$ is defined as the sum of all the agents' utilities, that is $SW_\gamma(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} u_i(\vec{x}, \vec{y}; \gamma)$. Notice that when $m = 1$, the Nash Equilibrium of the FCFS game is unique, since every agent can play only one strategy, hence the SW of the game is well defined. This is no longer true when we need to place more than one facility. In this case, the SW of the game changes depending on the specific Nash Equilibrium.

Example 1 Let us consider the case in which we have 5 agents and need to place two facilities with $k_1 = k_2 = 2$. Let $\vec{x} := (0, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.9) \in [0, 1]^5$ be the vector containing the agents' positions. If $\vec{y} = (0.3, 0.5)$, both $\gamma_1 = (1, 1, 2, 2, 2)$ and $\gamma_2 = (1, 1, 1, 2, 2)$ are pure NE of the FCFS game. However, the SW of the FCFS game depends on the specific NE, indeed $SW_{\gamma_1}(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = 3.6 > 3.5 = SW_{\gamma_2}(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$. Moreover, the utility the agent located at 0.9 is zero or 0.6 depending on the equilibrium.

Lastly, we define the optimal SW achievable on the instance \vec{x} as

$$SW_{opt}(\vec{x}) = \sup_{\vec{y} \in [0, 1]^m} \sup_{\gamma \in NE(\vec{x}, \vec{y})} SW_\gamma(\vec{x}, \vec{y}). \quad (1)$$




Fig. 1: The two Nash Equilibria described in Example 1. The circles represent the agents, the green squares the facilities and the red arrows the strategies played by the agents getting a non-null utility.

2.2 Mechanism Design Aspects of the problem

A key property that a mechanism M must possess is truthfulness, which ensures that no agent can increase their utility by misreporting their position. As shown in Example 1, the utility of an agent depends on the other agents' strategies. For this reason, we employ a stronger notion of truthfulness that keeps track of the different strategies that agents can play in the FCFS game.

Definition 1 A mechanism M is *absolutely truthful* if no agent increases its utility by misreporting, regardless of the strategies played by other agents. More formally, for every agent $i \in [n]$, $\vec{x} \in [0, 1]^n$, and $\vec{s}_{-i} \in [m]^{n-1}$, we have

$$\max_{s_i \in [m]} u_i(\vec{x}, M(\vec{x}); s_i, \vec{s}_{-i}) \geq \max_{s'_i \in [m]} u_i(\vec{x}, M(\vec{x}'); s'_i, \vec{s}_{-i}),$$

where (i) $\vec{x}' = (x'_i, \vec{x}_{-i})$ for every $x'_i \in [0, 1]$, (ii) \vec{x}_{-i} and \vec{s}_{-i} are the vectors containing the positions and strategies of the other $n - 1$ agents, respectively.

In general, the FCFS game induced by the output of a mechanism has multiple NE, hence the SW of the mechanism is not unique. For this reason, we introduce the notion of Equilibrium Stable mechanism.

Definition 2 An absolutely truthful mechanism M is said Equilibrium Stable (ES) if, for every \vec{x} , we have that

$$SW(\vec{x}, M(\vec{x}); \gamma) = SW(\vec{x}, M(\vec{x}); \gamma')$$

for every Nash Equilibria $\gamma, \gamma' \in NE(\vec{x}, M(\vec{x}))$.

An absolutely truthful mechanism is not necessarily ES. For example, consider the mechanism that places the facilities at $(0.3, 0.5)$ regardless of the agents' reports.

No agent can manipulate the outcome of the mechanism by changing their reports, however, going back to Example 1, we have that the mechanism induces two NE with different SW on the instance $(0, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.9)$. Finally, since we are considering the utilities of the agents, we define the approximation ratio of an ES mechanism as the worst-case ratio of the optimal SW and the SW achieved by the mechanism.

Definition 3 Let M be an absolutely truthful and ES mechanism. We define the approximation ratio of M as

$$ar(M) = \sup_{\vec{x} \in [0,1]^n} \frac{SW_{opt}(\vec{x})}{SW_M(\vec{x})},$$

where SW_M is the SW value achieved by M on any of the NE in $NE(\vec{x}, M(\vec{x}))$ and SW_{opt} is defined in (1).

3 Absolutely Truthful and Equilibrium Stable Mechanisms to place more than one facility

In this section, we study the class of percentile mechanisms and characterize under which conditions a percentile mechanism is absolutely truthful and ES.

Definition 4 (Percentile Mechanism, [13]) Given a percentile vector $\vec{v} \in [0, 1]^m$, the routine of the percentile vector associated with \vec{v} , namely $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$, is as follows: (i) The mechanism designer collects all the reports of the agents $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ and sorts them in non-decreasing order, so that $x_i \leq x_{i+1}$. (ii) The mechanism then places the m facilities at the positions $y_j = x_{i_j}$, where $i_j = \lfloor (n-1)v_j \rfloor + 1$ for every $j \in [m]$.

All percentile mechanisms are absolutely truthful.

Theorem 2 $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$ is absolutely truthful for every \vec{v} .

Proof Toward a contradiction, let $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$ be a percentile vector such that, on instance $\vec{x} \in [0, 1]^m$, the agent whose real position is x_i can manipulate by reporting $x'_i \in [0, 1]$. Let \vec{y} be the output of $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$ in the truthful input and let \vec{y}' be the output of $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$ after the agent manipulation. If $x'_i \leq x_i$, we have that the position of the facilities that $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$ places on the left of x_i move further to the left of x_i . Each facility that was placed by $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$ on the right of x_i does not change position. Thus it holds $|x_i - y_j| \leq |x_i - y'_j|$ for every $j \in [m]$. Finally, let $\vec{s}_{-i} \in [m]^{n-1}$ be a vector containing the strategies of the other agents and let us define with $F_i(\vec{z}) \subset [m]$ the set of strategies that give a non-null utility to the agent at x_i when the facilities are located at \vec{z} . Since $|x_i - y_j| \leq |x_i - y'_j|$ for every $j \in [m]$, we have that $F_i(\vec{y}') \subset F_i(\vec{y})$. To conclude, notice that for every $s_i \in F_i(\vec{y}')$ the utility of the manipulative agent decreases, as all the distances from the facilities have increased after the manipulation, which concludes the proof. \square

Unfortunately, not every percentile mechanism is ES: consider the situation represented in Example 1: the position of the facilities are the output of the $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$ with

$\vec{v} = (0.25, 0.75)$, however, different NE induce different SW values. In what follows, we characterize the set of percentile mechanisms that are ES and study their approximation ratio. Owing to this characterization, we identify the ES percentile mechanism with the lowest approximation ratio. For the sake of simplicity, we start our discussion from the case in which $m = 2$.

3.1 Mechanisms to Place Two Facilities

First, we study the case in which we place two facilities. We denote with k_1 and k_2 the capacities of the two facilities and assume that $k_1 + k_2 < n$. Without loss of generality, let $k_1 \geq k_2$. We show that each ES percentile mechanism belong to one of the following three categories: (i) the All-In-One (AIO) mechanisms, that place all the facilities at the same spot, that is $y_1 = y_2$; (ii) the Side-By-Side (SBS) mechanisms, that places the facilities at two adjacent positions, that is $y_1 = x_i$ and $y_2 = x_{i+1}$ where $i \in [n-1]$; and (iii) the Wide-Gap (WG) mechanism, which places the facilities at two agents positions that are well-separated, i.e. $y_1 = x_i$ and $y_2 = x_j$ where $i+1 < j$. Notice that each percentile mechanism belongs to exactly one of these three sub-classes, making the partition complete.

We start from the Wide-Gap mechanisms, as they are the more interesting class of ES percentile mechanisms.

3.1.1 Wide-Gap mechanisms

First, we show that for every k_1 and k_2 , there exists at least a WG percentile mechanism that is ES. Moreover, for every k_1 and k_2 , we compute the approximation ratio of every ES percentile mechanism and characterize the mechanism achieving the lowest approximation ratio. Notice that by definition of WG mechanisms, and without loss of generality, we assume that $v_1 < v_2$. Thus the facility with the highest capacity is always located on the left of the less capacious facility. The case in which $v_2 < v_1$ is symmetric and thus it does not need to be considered.

Theorem 3 *Let $\vec{v} = (v_1, v_2) \in [0, 1]^2$ be a percentile vector and let $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$ be its associated percentile mechanism. Let $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $k_1 + k_2 < n$ and $\lfloor v_2(n-1) \rfloor - \lfloor v_1(n-1) \rfloor > 1$. Then, we have that $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$ is ES if and only if*

$$\lfloor v_2(n-1) \rfloor - \lfloor v_1(n-1) \rfloor \geq k_2 + k_1 - 1. \quad (2)$$

Proof First, we show that condition (2) is sufficient to make a percentile mechanism ES. If \vec{v} satisfies (2), there are always $k_1 + k_2$ agents such that $y_1 \leq x_i \leq y_2$, where y_1 and y_2 are the two facility locations returned by the mechanism. Notice that if $y_1 = y_2$, then the two facilities share the position with $k_1 + k_2$ agents, hence the SW of any NE is equal to $k_1 + k_2$. Assume now that $y_1 < y_2$. Let us then define r_j the minimal values such that $B_{r_j}(y_j) \cap \{x_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ has cardinality larger or equal to k_j^* . Since there are at least $k_1 + k_2$ agents in $[y_1, y_2]$, we have that $r_1 + r_2 \leq |y_1 - y_2|$. According to every NE, agents that do not belong to either $B_{r_1}(y_1)$ or $B_{r_2}(y_2)$ have utility equal to 0. Indeed, if $\vec{s} \in NE(\vec{x}, \mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}(\vec{c}))$ is

*Here $B_r(y)$ denotes the ball centered in y of radius r .

such that $x_i \notin B_{r_1}(y_1) \cap B_{r_2}(y_2)$ gets accommodated by y_1 , we would have that at least one agent $x_j \in B_{r_1}(y_1)$ has null utility, hence $s_j = 2$. However, if agent x_j can increase its utility by changing its strategy to $s_j = 1$, hence $\vec{s} \notin NE(\vec{x}, \mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}(\vec{x}))$, which is a contradiction. By the same argument, we infer that every agent $x_i \in (y_j - r_j, y_j + r_j)$ attains utility $1 - |x_i - y_j|$ according to every NE. Finally, we observe that the set of agents such that $|x_i - y_j| = r_j$ that have non null utility may change according to the specific NE, but the total utility of these agents does not change. Thus condition (2) is sufficient to ensure $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$ is ES.

Lastly, we show that the condition is necessary. Let us assume that \vec{v} does not satisfy the condition (2). For the sake of simplicity, let us denote with $i_1 = \lfloor v_1(n-1) \rfloor + 1$ and $i_2 = \lfloor v_2(n-1) \rfloor + 1$. Let us consider the following instance $x_1 = \dots = x_{i_1-1} = 0$, $x_{i_1} = 0.4$, $x_{i_1+1} = \dots = x_{i_2-1} = 0.5$, $x_{i_2} = 0.6$ and $x_j = 0.9$ for all the other indexes $j > i_2$. Notice that, since $\lfloor v_2(n-1) \rfloor - \lfloor v_1(n-1) \rfloor > 1$, there is at least one agent located at 0.5. Following the same argument used in Example 1, we can show that, depending on the strategy played by the agents at 0.5, the Social Welfare of the mechanism changes. \square

Next, we characterize the approximation ratio of every WG percentile mechanism. Given a percentile vector $\vec{v} \in [0, 1]^2$ that satisfies condition (2), we denote with $i_1 = \lfloor v_1(n-1) \rfloor + 1$ and $i_2 = \lfloor v_2(n-1) \rfloor + 1$. Therefore that the mechanism places the facility with capacity k_1 at x_{i_1} and the facility with capacity k_2 at x_{i_2} .

Theorem 4 *Given n , k_1 , and k_2 , let $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$ an ES percentile mechanism. Then, if $i_1 \geq \lfloor \frac{k_1+1}{2} \rfloor$, we have that*

$$ar(\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}) = \frac{k_1 + k_2}{\min\{k_1 + (n - i_2) + 1, \frac{k_1+1}{2} + k_2\}} \quad (3)$$

If $i_1 < \lfloor \frac{k_1+1}{2} \rfloor$ and $i_2 < n - \lfloor \frac{k_2+1}{2} \rfloor$, we have

$$ar(\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}) = \frac{k_1 + k_2}{\min\{k_1 + (n - i_2) + 1, i_1 + k_2\}}.$$

Otherwise, we have

$$ar(\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}) = \frac{k_1 + k_2}{\min\{k_1 + \frac{k_2+1}{2}, k_2 + i_1\}}.$$

Proof Our argument is as follows: we show that the worst instance for the mechanism is either (i) $x_i = 0$ if $i \in \{1, \dots, i_1 - 1\}$, $x_{i_1} = \frac{1}{2}$, and $x_i = 1$ otherwise, or (ii) $x_i = 0$ if $i \in \{1, \dots, i_2 - 1\}$ and $x_i = 1$ otherwise. Notice that in both cases, the optimal SW is equal to $k_1 + k_2$, which is the maximum SW attainable. Let us show that the worst-case instance has the form described in (i) or (ii). Owing to Theorem 3, we have that there are at least $k_1 + k_2$ agents in the interval $[y_1, y_2]$, hence the agents that are accommodated by the facility at y_j are, up to ties, the k_j agents that are closer to y_j . Since $i_1 \geq \lfloor \frac{k_1+1}{2} \rfloor$, the total utility of the agent accommodated by the facility at y_1 is minimized when all the agents accommodated by y_1 are all at the same distance from y_1 , that is $|x_{i_1-1} - y_1| = |x_{i_1+1} - y_1|$. Given $\lambda \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, let us consider the following instance: $x_1 = \dots = x_{i_1-1} = 0$, $x_{i_1} = \lambda$, $x_{i_1+1} = \dots = x_{i_2-1} = 2\lambda$. Let us now consider the facility located at y_2 . By the same argument, we have that if $n - i_2$ is larger than $\lfloor \frac{k_2+1}{2} \rfloor$, then, for every λ , the position y_2 that minimizes the utility is $\frac{1}{2} + \lambda$. In this case, the cost of the mechanism is $2 + (1 - \lambda)(k_1 - 1) + (\frac{1}{2} + \lambda)(k_2 - 1)$. Since $k_1 \geq k_2$, we have that the minimum SW is achieved when $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$, thus all the agents on the right of

x_{i_1} are located at 1, all the agents on the left are located at 0 and $x_{i_1} = \frac{1}{2}$. In this case $SW_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{M}_{\vec{v}}}(\vec{x}) = \frac{k_1+1}{2} + k_2$, while $SW_{opt}(\vec{x}) = k_1 + k_2$, which is the maximum utility achievable and is attained by placing both facilities at 1. Consider now the case $n - i_2 < \lfloor \frac{k_2+1}{2} \rfloor$. In this case, for every λ , the worst position for y_2 is 1, hence the SW of the mechanism is $n - i_2 + 2 + (1 - \lambda)(k_1 - 1) + 2\lambda(k_2 - n + i_2 - 1)$, therefore the SW is minimized when $\lambda = 0$ or $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$. In particular, we have that worst Social Welfare attainable by the mechanism is

$$\min\{n - i_2 + k_1 + 1, \frac{1}{2}(k_1 + 1) + k_2\}.$$

Since $SW_{opt}(\vec{x}) = k_1 + k_2$, we conclude the first part of the proof.

We now consider the case in which $i_1 < \lfloor \frac{k_1+1}{2} \rfloor$. First, we consider the case in which $i_2 < n - \lfloor \frac{k_2+1}{2} \rfloor$. By the same argument used to prove the case in which $i_1 \geq \lfloor \frac{k_1+1}{2} \rfloor$, we have that the worst-case instance in this case is

$$x_i = \begin{cases} x_i = 0 & \text{if } i = 1, \dots, i_1, \\ x_i = \lambda & \text{if } i = i_1 + 1, \dots, i_2 - 1, \\ x_i = 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

for some $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, since the SW of the mechanism is minimized when the i_1 -th and i_2 -th agents are at the extremes of the interval. For any value of λ , the SW of the mechanism is

$$SW(\vec{x}) = i_1 + (n - i_2) + (1 - \lambda)(k_1 - i_1) + \lambda(k_2 - (n - i_2)).$$

Since $SW(\vec{x})$ is linear in λ , we have that the minimum is achieved at either $\lambda = 0$ or $\lambda = 1$. Thus the minimal SW achievable is

$$\min\{k_1 + (n - i_2), k_2 + i_1\}.$$

Since in both cases we have that the optimal SW is $k_1 + k_2$, we conclude the thesis.

Lastly, we consider the case in which $n - i_2 \geq \lfloor \frac{k_2+1}{2} \rfloor$ and $i_1 < \lfloor \frac{k_1+1}{2} \rfloor$. In this case, the worst-case instance places the first i_1 agents at 0, therefore the instances we need to consider are

$$x_i = \begin{cases} x_i = 0 & \text{if } i = 1, \dots, i_1, \\ x_i = \lambda & \text{if } i = i_1 + 1, \dots, i_2 - 1, \\ x_{i_2} = \frac{\lambda+1}{2} \\ x_i = 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The SW induced by the mechanism is then

$$SW(\vec{x}) = i_1 + 1 + (1 - \lambda)(k_1 - i_1) + \frac{1 + \lambda}{2}(k_2 - 1).$$

Again, since the SW is linear in λ , we have that the minimum is attained at either $\lambda = 0$ or $\lambda = 1$. Then the minimum SW achievable by the mechanism is

$$\min\left\{k_1 + \frac{(k_2 + 1)}{2}, k_2 + i_1\right\}.$$

To conclude notice that in both cases, the SW attained by the optimal solution is $k_1 + k_2$. \square

Consequentially, we characterize the best ES percentile mechanisms given any 2-dimensional vector \vec{k} . In particular, we show that the approximation of the best percentile mechanism decreases as $\Delta := n - (k_1 + k_2)$ increases.

Theorem 5 *Given n and \vec{k} , let us define $\Delta = n - (k_1 + k_2)$, then we have that the ES WG percentile mechanism that achieves the lowest approximation ratio is induced by the percentile vector $\vec{v} = (\frac{i_1}{n}, \frac{i_2}{n})$, where i_1 and i_2 are as follows*

- (i) $i_1 = \lceil \frac{k_1}{2} \rceil$ and $i_2 = n - \lfloor \frac{k_2}{2} \rfloor$ if $\Delta \geq \lceil \frac{k_1+k_2}{2} \rceil$, in which case $ar(\mathcal{PM}_{\bar{v}}) = \frac{k_1+k_2}{\frac{k_1+1}{2}+k_2}$,
- (ii) $i_1 = k_1 - k_2 + \alpha$ and $i_2 = n - \alpha$, where $\alpha = \lceil \frac{\Delta - (k_1 - k_2)}{2} \rceil$, if $k_1 - k_2 \leq \Delta \leq \lfloor \frac{k_1+k_2}{2} \rfloor + 1$, in which case $ar(\mathcal{PM}_{\bar{v}}) = \frac{k_1+k_2}{i_1+k_2}$, and
- (iii) $i_1 = \Delta + 1$ and $i_2 = n$ otherwise, in which case $ar(\mathcal{PM}_{\bar{v}}) = \frac{k_1+k_2}{\Delta+k_2+1}$.

Proof When $\Delta \geq \lceil \frac{k_1+k_2}{2} \rceil$, the indexes $i_1 = \lceil \frac{k_1}{2} \rceil$ and $i_2 = n - \lfloor \frac{k_2}{2} \rfloor$ are well defined. Owing to Theorem 3 and by definition of Δ , we have that $\mathcal{PM}_{\bar{v}}$ is ES. Finally, from Theorem 4, we infer that

$$ar(\mathcal{PM}_{\bar{v}}) = \frac{k_1 + k_2}{\frac{k_1+1}{2} + k_2},$$

which is the smallest approximation ratio achievable by an ES WG percentile mechanism.

Let us consider the case (ii), that is $k_1 - k_2 \leq \Delta \leq \lfloor \frac{k_1+k_2}{2} \rfloor + 1$. Owing to Theorem 4, we retrieve the best values i_1 and i_2 by maximizing the quantity

$$\min\{k_1 + (n - i_2), i_1 + k_2\}.$$

Thus, we look for i_1 and i_2 such that

$$k_1 + (n - i_2) = i_1 + k_2,$$

subject to the constraint

$$n - i_2 + i_1 = \Delta,$$

since, owing to Theorem 2, $k_1 + k_2$ agents must lay between x_{i_1} and x_{i_2} . By a simple computation, we have that

$$n - i_2 = \frac{k_2 - k_1 + \Delta}{2},$$

thus $i_1 = \frac{\Delta - (k_2 - k_1)}{2} = k_1 - k_2 + \frac{\Delta - (k_2 - k_1)}{2}$ and $i_2 = n - \frac{k_2 - k_1 + \Delta}{2}$, which concludes the proof of case (ii).

Lastly, we consider case (iii). In this case, we have that $\Delta < k_1 - k_2$, thus we have

$$k_2 + i_1 - k_1 - (n - i_2) = i_2 - n + i_1 + k_2 - k_1 \leq \Delta + k_2 - k_1 < 0,$$

since $i_2 - n + i_1 < n - i_2 + i_1 \leq \Delta$. Thus the minimum SW attainable by the mechanism is $i_1 + k_2$, therefore, to maximize the minimum achievable SW, we need to set $i_1 = \Delta$ and $i_2 = n$, which concludes the proof. \square

Notice that the lowest approximation ratio is achieved when $\Delta \geq \lceil \frac{k_1+k_2}{2} \rceil$. Moreover, notice that the smaller the gap between k_1 and k_2 , that is $k_1 - k_2$, the lower the approximation ratio of the best percentile mechanism. In particular, the lowest approximation ratio is attained when $k_1 = k_2$ and $n \geq 3k$, in which case there exists a percentile mechanism whose approximation ratio is $\frac{4}{3+\frac{1}{k}} \sim \frac{4}{3}$.

3.1.2 The All-In-One and Side-By-Side mechanisms

We conclude our study by considering the AIO and the SBS mechanisms. Unlike the WG mechanisms, each AIO and SBS is ES. We consider the AIO mechanisms first. Since all the AIO mechanisms place the facilities at the same position, every Nash Equilibrium induced by the facility placement achieves the same Social Welfare. Moreover, it is easy to see that the best AIO mechanism places the both the facilities at the median agent. Indeed, we have the following.

Theorem 6 *The best AIO mechanism places all the facilities at the median agent. Moreover, denoted with M the mechanism that places both facility at the median agent, we have that*

$$ar(M) = \begin{cases} \frac{2k_2 + 2\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 1}{k_1 + k_2 + 1} & \text{if } k_1 \geq \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil \\ \frac{2(k_2 + k_1)}{k_1 + k_2 + 1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Proof We prove this theorem as it follows: first, we compute the approximation ratio of a generic AIO mechanism and then show that the approximation ratio is minimized when the AIO mechanism places both facility at a median agent. Let then M be an AIO mechanism such that $y_1 = y_2 = x_r$ where $r \in [n]$. Without loss of generality, we assume $r \leq \lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor$.

We notice that, given an instance \vec{x} , it is possible to increase the optimal Social Welfare and decrease the Social Welfare of the mechanism by moving all the agents that are not the r -th agent to either 0 or 1. We therefore restrict our attention to instances such that $x_1 = \dots = x_{r-1} = 0$, $x_r = \lambda \in [0, 1]$, and $x_j = 1$ otherwise. Since we have that $r \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, we have that the worst-case instance happens when $\lambda \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, thus the Social Welfare achieved by the mechanism can be computed explicitly

$$SW_M(\vec{x}) = 1 + (1 - \lambda) \min\{r - 1, k_1 + k_2 - 1\} + \lambda(k_1 + k_2 - \min\{k_1 + k_2, r\}).$$

To complete the proof we need to compute the optimal SW achievable on these instances. Since $r \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ and $k_1 \geq k_2$, we have that the optimal solution either places the two facilities at 1, in which case the SW is equal to

$$SW_{opt,1} = \min\{n - r + \lambda, k_1 + k_2\},$$

or places the facility with capacity k_2 at 0 and the facility with capacity k_1 at 1, in which case the optimal SW is equal to

$$SW_{opt,2} = \min\{r - \lambda, k_2\} + \min\{n - r + \lambda, k_1\}.$$

So that $SW_{opt} = \max\{SW_{opt,1}, SW_{opt,2}\}$ and hence

$$ar(M) = \max_{\lambda \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]} \left\{ \frac{\max\{\min\{n - r + \lambda, k_1 + k_2\}, \min\{r - \lambda, k_2\} + \min\{n - r + \lambda, k_1\}\}}{1 + (1 - \lambda) \min\{r - 1, k_1 + k_2 - 1\} + \lambda(k_1 + k_2 - \min\{k_1 + k_2, r\})} \right\}.$$

We notice that this quantity is minimized when $r = \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$, which proves that the best AIO mechanism is the one placing all the facilities at the median agent.

Let us now compute the approximation ratio of the median mechanism, that is $r = \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$. Moreover, since $SW_{opt} \geq SW_M$, $k_1 \geq k_1$, and both SW_M and SW_{opt} are piecewise linear functions with respect to λ , we have that the maximum defining $ar(M)$ is attained when wither $\lambda = 0$ or $\frac{1}{2}$. We then conclude that

$$ar(M) = \max_{\lambda \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}} \left\{ \frac{\max\{\min\{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + \lambda, k_1 + k_2\}, k_2 + \min\{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + \lambda, k_1\}\}}{\lambda + (1 - \lambda) \min\{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor, k_1 + k_2\} + \lambda(k_1 + k_2 - \min\{k_1 + k_2, \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil\})} \right\},$$

where we used the fact that $k_2 \leq \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$. Which allows us to conclude (4) and thus the proof. \square

We then consider the SBS mechanisms. As for the AIO mechanisms, every SBS mechanism is ES.

Theorem 7 *Each SBS mechanism is ES.*

Proof Let PM be an SBS percentile mechanism and let i be the parameter such that $y_1 = x_i$ and $y_2 = x_{i+1}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that the facility at y_1 has capacity k_1 and that the facility at y_2 has capacity k_2 . Let \vec{x} be the vector containing the reports of n agents, we now show that every NE equilibrium induced by placing the facilities at $y_1 = x_i$ and $y_2 = x_{i+1}$ achieves the same SW. Notice that if $y_1 = y_2$, there is nothing to prove, we then consider the case in which $y_1 < y_2$.

Let us now define

$$A_1 := \{x_i \leq y_1\} \quad \text{and} \quad A_2 := \{x_i \geq y_2\}. \quad (5)$$

Notice that $A_1 \cup A_2 = \{x_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ and $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$. By definition, every agent in A_1 is strictly closer to y_1 and every agent in A_2 is strictly closer in y_2 . We have three cases: (i) $|A_1| \leq k_1$ and $|A_2| \leq k_2$; (ii) $|A_1| > k_1$ and $|A_2| \leq k_2$; and (iii) $|A_1| \leq k_1$ and $|A_2| > k_2$.

Case (i): In this case, we have that in every NE, the agents getting access to the facilities are, up to breaking ties, the k_1 rightmost agents in A_1 and the k_2 leftmost agents in A_2 . In particular the SW remains constant across all the possible Nash Equilibria.

Case (ii): In this case, we have that in every NE, the agents getting access to the facilities are, up to breaking ties, the $a_1 := |A_1|$ agents in A_1 and the $k_2 + k_1 - a_1$ leftmost agents in A_2 . Notice that, up to ties, the k_2 leftmost agents in A_2 are served by the facility at y_2 , while the other $k_1 - a_2$ are served by the facility y_1 . In particular the SW remains constant across all the possible Nash Equilibria.

Case (iii): This case follows from an argument similar to the one used to handle Case (ii). Thus we conclude the proof. \square

Lastly, we notice that the approximation ratio of any SBS mechanism can be obtained by following the same argument used to prove Theorem 6. Indeed, it is easy to see that the worst-case instance of the SBS places the two facilities at the same position, i.e. $y_1 = y_2$, as otherwise it would be possible to increase the ratio by overlapping the two facilities. For this reason, the worst-case guarantees of the SBS mechanisms are similar to the worst-case guarantees of the AIO mechanisms, hence the SBS mechanism that achieves the lowest approximation ratio is the one placing facilities at $x_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}$ and $x_{\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor}$.

3.2 Beyond two facilities

We now extend our study to the case in which we want to place $m > 2$ facilities. For the sake of simplicity, we consider m facilities that have the same capacity k . The techniques used in this section can be easily extended to the case in which facilities have different capacities. Notice that, in this case, any percentile mechanism needs to be endowed with a permutation to specify how to assign the different capacities to the positions returned by the mechanism [29, 32].

First, we extend Theorem 3 to this framework.

Theorem 8 *Let k be the capacity of m facilities. Moreover, let \vec{v} be a percentile vector such that $v_1 < v_2 < \dots < v_m$ so that \vec{v} does not possess two equal entries and let $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$ be its associated percentile mechanism. Assume that $\lfloor v_{j+1}(n-1) \rfloor - \lfloor v_j(n-1) \rfloor > 1$ for every*

$j \in [m-1]$. Then $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$ is ES if and only if the following system of inequalities is satisfied

$$\begin{cases} \lfloor v_2(n-1) \rfloor - \lfloor v_1(n-1) \rfloor \geq 2k-1 \\ \dots \\ \lfloor v_m(n-1) \rfloor - \lfloor v_{m-1}(n-1) \rfloor \geq 2k-1 \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Proof The proof follows by the same argument used to prove Theorem 3. Indeed, by condition (6) for every $j \in [m]$ we have that at least $2k$ agents are located between y_j and y_{j+1} , thus the Social Welfare generated by the facilities at y_j and y_{j+1} does not depend on the specific Nash Equilibrium. To conclude the proof, it suffices to apply this argument to each couple of facilities (y_j, y_{j+1}) . \square

The set of inequalities (6) allows us to characterize the vectors \vec{v} that induces an ES percentile mechanism $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$ depending on the capacity k . Notice that system (6) does not admit any solution when $k > \frac{n+m}{2m}$ or, equivalently, $n < (2k-1)m$. Indeed, by summing all the inequalities in (6), we have that

$$\lfloor v_m(n-1) \rfloor - \lfloor v_1(n-1) \rfloor \geq (2k-1)m.$$

Since $n \geq \lfloor v_m(n-1) \rfloor - \lfloor v_1(n-1) \rfloor$, we must have that $n \geq (2k-1)m$. Although when $n < (2k-1)m$ it is impossible to define an ES percentile mechanism that places m facilities at m different locations, it is possible to define an ES percentile mechanism that places all the facilities at one or two different locations. To keep the discussion on track, we first study the case in which system (6) admits a solution and defer the pathological case to a dedicated section.

3.3 Case $n \geq (2k-1)m$.

In this case, it is possible to select an ES and absolutely truthful percentile mechanism that places the m facilities at m different positions among the agents' reports.

Theorem 9 *If $k < \frac{n+m}{2m}$, then given an ES $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$, we have*

$$ar(\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}) = \begin{cases} \frac{mk}{(m-\frac{1}{2})k+\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } i_1, n-i_m \geq \lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor \\ \frac{mk}{(m-1)k+\min\{i_1, n-i_m\}} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $i_1 = \lfloor v_1(n-1) \rfloor + 1$ and $i_m = \lfloor v_m(n-1) \rfloor + 1$.

Proof The case in which $i_1, n-i_m \geq \lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor$ follows by the same argument adopted in the proof of Theorem 4. Indeed, by definition of the mechanism, the SW of the mechanism is minimized when each facility $y_j = x_{\lfloor v_j(n-1) \rfloor + 1}$ is such that $|y_j - x_{\lfloor v_j(n-1) \rfloor}| = |y_j - x_{\lfloor v_j(n-1) \rfloor + 2}|$. Hence the mechanism achieves the minimal SW when $x_{\lfloor v_j(n-1) \rfloor + 1} = \frac{2j-1}{2m}$ for every $j \in [m]$ and $x_i = \frac{l}{m}$ if $\lfloor v_l(n-1) \rfloor + 1 < i < \lfloor v_{l+1}(n-1) \rfloor + 1$ where $l = 0, 1, \dots, m$, $v_0 = 0$ and $v_{m+1} = 1$. On such instance the SW of the mechanism is $(m-\frac{1}{2})k + \frac{1}{2}$. Notice the mechanism achieves the same SW on the instance \vec{x}_O defined as $(x_O)_i = 0$ for every $i \leq \lfloor v_1(n-1) \rfloor + 1$, and $(x_O)_i = 1$ otherwise. To conclude, we observe that the optimal SW on instance \vec{x}_O is mk .

To conclude the proof, we need to consider the case in which either i_1 or $n - i_m$ are lower than $\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor$.

Since the other case is symmetric, we restrict our analysis to the case in which $i_1 \leq n - i_2$. Again, since $i_1, n - i_m \leq \lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor$, we have that the worst-case instance places the first i_1 agents at 0 and the last $n - i_m + 1$ at 1. Since every facility has the same capacity, we have that the worst-case instance has the following form

$$x_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = 1, \dots, i_1, \\ \delta_1 & \text{if } i = i_1 + 1, \dots, i_2 - 1, \\ \delta_1 + \frac{1 - \delta_1 - \delta_2}{2(m-2)} & \text{if } i = i_2, \\ \delta_1 + 2 \frac{1 - \delta_1 - \delta_2}{2(m-2)} & \text{if } i = i_2 + 1, \dots, i_3 - 1, \\ \delta_1 + 3 \frac{1 - \delta_1 - \delta_2}{2(m-2)} & \text{if } i = i_3, \\ \delta_1 + 4 \frac{1 - \delta_1 - \delta_2}{2(m-2)} & \text{if } i = i_3 + 1, \dots, i_4 - 1, \\ \dots & \\ 1 - \delta_2 & \text{if } i = i_{m-1} + 1, \dots, i_m - 1, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\delta_1, \delta_2 \geq 0$ and such that $\delta_1 + \delta_2 \leq 1$. The SW of the mechanism on this instance is

$$SW(\vec{x}) = i_1 + (n - i_2) + m - 2 + (k - i_1)(1 - \delta_1) + \sum_{i=2}^{m-2} \left((k - 1) \left(\frac{m - 3 + \delta_1 + \delta_2}{m - 2} \right) \right) + (k - (n - i_m))(1 - \delta_2).$$

Again, this quantity is linear in δ_1 and δ_2 , thus it is minimized when $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in \{0, 1\}$. By plugging in the possible combinations, we infer that the minimum is achieved when $\delta_1 = 1$ and $\delta_2 = 0$ since $i_1 \leq n - i_m$. \square

In particular, for every given the capacity k and number of facility m , it is possible to detect the best possible ES and absolutely truthful percentile mechanism.

Theorem 10 *Given k, m , and n , let us define $\alpha = \lfloor \frac{(n - 2k(m-1) + 1)}{2} \rfloor$. The vector \vec{v} where $v_j = \frac{\alpha + (2k-1)(j-1)}{n}$ for $j \in [m]$ induces the ES percentile mechanism with the lowest approximation ratio. In particular, if $n \geq 2km$, the approximation ratio of $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$ is less than $1 + \frac{1}{2m-1}$.*

Proof Owing to Theorem 9, the approximation ratio is lower when $\min\{i_1, n - i_m\}$ is maximized, thus when $i_1 = n - i_m$. Thus the best mechanism places the first and last facility at x_ℓ and $x_{n-\ell}$, where ℓ is a suitable integer. Since $i_1 + n - i_m = n - 2k(m-1) + 1$, we complete the first half of the proof.

Notice that, if i_1 or i_m is less than $\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor$, then we have that $\min\{i_1, i_m\} \leq \lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor$. By comparing the Social Welfare computed in the Theorem 9, we have that $\left(m - \frac{1}{2}\right)k + \frac{1}{2} \geq (m-1)k + \min\{i_1, i_m\}$, indeed

$$\left(m - \frac{1}{2}\right)k + \frac{1}{2} - (m-1)k - \min\{i_1, i_m\} \geq \frac{k}{2} + \frac{1}{2} - \lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor \geq 0,$$

thus the approximation ratio of the mechanism is smaller when $i_1, i_m \geq \lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor$. Moreover, in this case, the approximation ratio does not depend on the specific \vec{v} , thus any ES percentile

mechanism whose \vec{v} is such that $i_1, i_m \geq \lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor$ achieves the minimum approximation ratio. Notice that, by definition, the vector \vec{v} where $v_j = \frac{\alpha + (2k-1)(j-1)}{n}$ for $j \in [m]$ where $\alpha = \lfloor \frac{(n-2k(m-1)+1)}{2} \rfloor$ is such that $i_1, i_m \geq \lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor$. Moreover, owing to Theorem 2, it is also ES, hence it achieves the minimal approximation ratio.

Lastly, notice that

$$\frac{mk}{(m - \frac{1}{2})k + \frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{mk}{(m - \frac{1}{2})k} = \frac{(m - \frac{1}{2})k + \frac{k}{2}}{(m - \frac{1}{2})k} = 1 + \frac{1}{2m - 1},$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Notice that, if $n \geq 2km$, the approximation ratio of the best percentile mechanism decreases as the number of facilities increases. Noticeably, when m goes to infinity, the approximation ratio goes to 1.

3.4 Case $n < (2k - 1)m$.

We now consider the case in which the number of agent is too small and thus Theorem 8 does not hold. In this case, it is possible to circumvent Theorem 8, by considering an percentile mechanism that places all the facilities at either one or two locations, that is the percentile mechanisms whose associated vector \vec{v} has at most two different entries. When more than one facility is placed at the same location, we considered them as a unique facility whose capacity is the sum of all the facilities placed at the common location. Notice that it is sufficient to consider the case in which facilities are divided between at most two points. Indeed, splitting the facilities between three or more positions leads to another unfeasible system of the form (6).

Owing to the results of Section 3.1, we have that there are only three ways in which the facilities can be grouped.

3.4.1 The All-aside mechanisms

When the mechanism places the facilities at two different locations, we can use the results proposed in Section 3.1. Indeed, owing to Theorem 5, we know that the approximation ratio becomes lower as the difference in capacity between facilities is smaller. For this reason, we consider a mechanism that splits the facilities as evenly as possible.

Mechanism 1 (All-aside mechanism). *Let k be the capacity of m facilities and let $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $a + 2mk \leq b \leq n$. Given in input a vector $\vec{x} \in [0, 1]^n$, the All-aside mechanism associated with a and b , namely $AS_{a,b}$, places $\lceil \frac{m}{2} \rceil$ facilities at x_a and $\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor$ facilities at x_b .*

Owing to Theorem 3, the All-aside mechanism is absolutely truthful and ES. Moreover, we can extend Theorem 4 to this case.

Theorem 11 *The approximation ratio of every $AS_{a,b}$ is determined by Theorem 4 by setting $k_1 = \lceil \frac{m}{2} \rceil k$, $k_2 = \lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor k$, $i_1 = a$, and $i_2 = b$.*

Proof It follows directly from Theorem 4. Indeed, it suffices to prove that even if we have m facilities to locate, the optimal SW we can obtain by locating m facilities with capacity l is the same as locating two facilities with capacity $\lceil \frac{m}{2} \rceil k$ and $\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor k$. Since the worst-case instance of any $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$ with $\vec{v} \in [0, 1]^2$ places i_1 agents 0 and the others at 1, the optimal SW remains mk even though we locate m facilities separately. \square

3.4.2 The AIO and SBS mechanisms

Lastly, we consider the case in which the mechanism places all the facilities at one place, hence the percentile vector $\vec{v} = (v, v, \dots, v)$ for a $v \in [0, 1]$. In this case, every $\vec{v} = (v, v, \dots, v)$ induces an absolutely truthful and ES mechanism. By the same argument used to prove Theorem 6, the best percentile mechanism places all the facilities at the median agent, that is $\vec{m} = (0.5, 0.5, \dots, 0.5)$. In our case, however, the approximation ratio guarantees are worse than the one presented in [2]. Indeed, since in our case the capacity can be split at m different locations, the optimal solution has a further degree of freedom that heightens the approximation ratio of the mechanism.

Theorem 12 *Let $k > 1$ be the capacity of the facilities and fix $\vec{v} = (0.5, \dots, 0.5)$. If $n \leq (m + 1)k$, we have that*

$$ar(\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}) = \frac{2(m-1)k + (n - (m-1)k) + 1}{mk + 1}.$$

Otherwise, $ar(\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}) = \frac{2mk}{mk+1} = 2 - \frac{2}{mk+1}$.

Proof By definition, we have that for every input $\vec{x} \in [0, 1]^n$ the facility is placed at $x_{\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor}$. The number of agents on the left of y_1 and the number of agents on the right of y_1 is the same, hence the SW of the mechanism is minimized when $x_i = 0$ when $i < \lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor$, $x_{\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor} = \frac{1}{2}$, and $x_i = 1$ otherwise. The SW of the mechanism is $\frac{mk+1}{2}$.

If $n \leq (m + 1)k$, the optimal SW on the instance is $(m - 1)k + \frac{n - (m - 1)k}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$. Indeed, we can locate $m - 1$ facilities at either 0 or 1 that only accommodate the agents at 0 and 1. The total combined utility of the agents accommodated by these $m - 1$ facilities is $(m - 1)k$. Since the agents are divided evenly among 0 and 1, the maximum utility attainable by the last facility is at most $\frac{n - (m - 1)k}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore the total utility of the optimal SW is $(m - 1)k + \frac{n - (m - 1)k}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$.

If $n > (m + 1)k$, the optimal SW on this instance is mk , and it is attained when $\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor$ facilities are placed at 0 and the others at 1. To conclude the thesis it suffices to take the ratio of the optimal SW and the SW of the mechanism. \square

Remark 1 Notice that the highest approximation ratio occurs when $n = km + 1$, in which case $ar(\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}) = 2 - \frac{k}{mk+1}$. Thus, as the number of facilities increases, we attain an approximation ratio that converges to 2

Lastly, we observe that Side-By-Side mechanisms can be generalized to this case. It suffices to distribute all facilities between the positions of two consecutive agents.

As for the case where $m = 2$, the worst-case analysis of these mechanisms is conducted in a similar manner to the AIO mechanisms, yielding comparable results.

4 The Higher Dimensional Problem

In this section, we extend our study to higher dimensional settings. We recall that an m -dimensional percentile mechanism is defined by a d times m matrix $V = (v^{(1)}, v^{(2)}, \dots, v^{(d)})$, where each row vector $v^{(j)} = (v_1^{(j)}, v_2^{(j)}, \dots, v_m^{(j)}) \in [0, 1]^m$ lies within the unit cube. Given the agents' reports \vec{x} , the percentile mechanism associated with V determines the k -th facility's location by selecting, for each dimension $j \leq d$, the $v_k^{(j)}$ -th percentile of the ordered projection of \vec{x} on the j -th dimension to be the coordinate of k -th facility in that dimension. More formally, we have that

$$y^{(j)} = (z_{\lfloor v_j^{(1)}(n-1) \rfloor + 1}^{(1)}, z_{\lfloor v_j^{(2)}(n-1) \rfloor + 1}^{(2)}, \dots, z_{\lfloor v_j^{(d)}(n-1) \rfloor + 1}^{(d)}),$$

where $z^{(l)}$ is the vector containing the projections of the agents positions on the l -coordinates re-ordered increasingly. To summarize, a d -dimensional percentile mechanism determines the coordinates of the facilities by running d percentile mechanism along each coordinate. We call the percentile mechanism determining the j -th coordinates of the m facilities the j -th coordinate percentile mechanism.

In what follows, we extend our framework to higher-dimensional problems and demonstrate that most of the previously presented results do not generalize to this setting. This remains true even when we need to locate only two facilities among agents supported in a bidimensional space. For this reason and for the sake of simplicity, we limit our discussion to the case where two facilities need to be located, and each agent position is a point in the unit cube $[0, 1]^2$.

4.1 The Setting

Let $\vec{x} \in ([0, 1]^2)^n$ be the bi-dimensional vector containing the position of n agents in the interval $[0, 1]^2$, so that $\vec{x} = (x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)})$, where $x^{(i)} = (x_1^{(i)}, x_2^{(i)}) \in [0, 1]^2$ is the vector containing the coordinates of the i -th agent. We denote with $\vec{k} = (k_1, k_2)$ the 2-dimensional vector containing all the capacities of the 2 facilities, and assume that $k_1 + k_2 < n$. In this case, a mechanism is a function $M : ([0, 1]^2)^n \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^2)^2$ that maps a vector containing the agents' reports to a facility location $\vec{y} = (y^{(1)}, y^{(2)})$, where $y^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is the position of the facility with capacity k_j .

As for the one dimensional case, once the facilities are located, agents compete in a First-Come-First-Served (FCFS) to determine their utilities. The FCFS game is defined as in Section 2, with the only difference being that the distance between an agent located at $\vec{x}^{(i)}$ and a facility located at $\vec{y}^{(j)}$ is

$$d(\vec{x}^{(i)}, \vec{y}^{(j)}) = \sqrt{(x_1^{(i)} - y_1^{(j)})^2 + (x_2^{(i)} - y_2^{(j)})^2},$$

so that the utility of every agent is either 0 or $\sqrt{2} - d(\vec{x}^{(i)}, \vec{y}^{(j)})$ depending on the outcome of the FCFS game. It is then easy to see that the construction used to prove

Theorem 1 trivially extends to this case, so that a pure Nash Equilibrium to the FCFS game always exists. Lastly, given a Nash Equilibrium, namely γ , we define the Social Welfare associated with γ as the sum of all the agent's utilities according to γ .

4.2 The Equilibrium Stable Mechanisms

We now discuss under which conditions a percentile mechanism is ES in the higher dimensional framework. First of all, we notice that every ES percentile mechanism M must be such that each Coordinate Percentile Mechanism (CPM) is ES. Indeed, if the first CPM was not ES, it means that there exists a one dimensional instance $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ whose Nash Equilibria induce different Social Welfare values. It is then easy to see that the percentile mechanism M is not ES by considering the instance $\{x^{(i)} = (x_i, 0)\}_{i \in [n]}$. Unfortunately, assuming that each coordinate percentile mechanism is ES does not guarantee that the percentile mechanism is ES in higher dimensions. In particular, enforcing Theorem 9 to each coordinate percentile mechanism is not enough to characterize all the ES percentile mechanisms when $d > 2$. As the next example shows, percentile mechanisms whose coordinate percentile mechanisms are SBS or WG mechanisms no longer ensure that the mechanism is ES.

Example 2 Let us consider a problem in which we have 10 agents, that is $n = 10$, and two facilities with capacity 2, that is $k_1 = k_2 = 2$. Let us consider the percentile mechanism induced by $v^{(1)} = v^{(2)} = (0.4, 0.5)$, so that both the coordinate percentile mechanisms are SBS mechanisms. In what follows, we denote this mechanism with PM. Let us consider the following instance $x_1 = x_2 = x_3 = (0, 0)$, $x_4 = (0.4, 0.4)$, $x_5 = (0.4, 0.5)$, $x_6 = (0.5, 0.5)$, and $x_7 = \dots = x_{10} = (0.8, 0.8)$, so that PM places the facilities at $(0.4, 0.4)$ and $(0.5, 0.5)$. Notice that, depending on what strategy the agent at $(0.4, 0.5)$ plays, the Social Welfare induced by the percentile mechanism changes.

Example 2, can be extended to handle any percentile mechanism whose coordinates are either SBS or WG. Indeed, the only percentile mechanisms that are ES for higher dimensional problem must determine one of the two coordinates using an AIO mechanism. In particular, we now show that any percentile mechanism whose CPMs are two AIO mechanisms or AIO mechanism an SBS mechanism are ES.

Theorem 13 *A percentile mechanisms is ES if and only if all its CPMs are AIO mechanisms or all the CPMs but one are AIO mechanisms. In the latter case, the CPM that is not an AIO mechanism must be a SBS mechanism.*

Proof If a percentile mechanism uses two AIO mechanisms to determine the coordinates of the facilities, we have that the mechanisms places all the facilities at the same spot, thus the mechanism is trivially ES.

Let us consider the other case, in which one coordinate is determined via an AIO mechanism and the other one by an SBS mechanism. Without loss of generality, let us assume that the first coordinate is determined by the SBS, so that both the facilities have the same




Fig. 2: The two Nash Equilibria described in Example 2. The circles represent the agents (agents from 1 to 4 are represented by x_i while agents from 8 to 10 are represented by x_j), the green squares the facilities and the red arrows the strategies played by the agents getting a non-null utility in the two different Nash Equilibria.

second coordinate, i.e. $y_2^{(1)} = y_2^{(2)}$. Let us define the following sets

$$A_1 = \{x^{(i)} \text{ s.t. } x_1^{(i)} \leq y_1^{(1)}\} \quad \text{and} \quad A_2 = \{x^{(i)} \text{ s.t. } x_1^{(i)} \geq y_1^{(2)}\}. \quad (7)$$

From our assumptions, we have that $A_1 \cup A_2 = \{x^{(i)}\}_{i \in [n]}$ and $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$. By definition of A_1 and A_2 , we have that every agent in A_1 prefers $y^{(1)}$ to $y^{(2)}$. Vice-versa, every agent in A_2 prefers $y^{(2)}$ to $y^{(1)}$. We can then conclude the proof by using the same argument used to prove Theorem 7. \square

Lastly, we show that a mechanism determining the facilities using an AIO and a WG mechanism is not ES.

Example 3 Let us consider an instance for $n = 10$, $k_1 = k_2 = 2$, and the percentile mechanism induced by the vectors $v^{(1)} = (0, 0.3)$ and $v^{(2)} = (0, 0)$. Owing to Theorem 3, we have that each coordinate percentile mechanism is ES, however the global percentile mechanism is not. Indeed, let us consider the following instance $x_1 = (0, 0)$, $x_2 = (0.2, 0)$, $x_3 = (0.2, 1)$, $x_4 = (0.4, 0)$, and $x_5 = \dots = x_{10} = (0.7, 0)$. The percentile mechanism places the facilities at $(0, 0)$ and at $(0.4, 0)$. This facility location induces two Nash Equilibria, one in which agent x_3 plays 1 and one in which agent x_3 plays 2. When agent x_3 plays 1, we have that one of the agents located at $(0.5, 0)$ is accommodated by y_2 , thus the Social Welfare is $\sqrt{2}(3.5)$. If agent x_3 plays 2, one of the agents located at $(0.7, 0)$ is accommodated by the facility y_1 , thus the Social Welfare is $\sqrt{2}(3.1)$. We then conclude that the percentile mechanism is not ES.

Lastly, we characterize the approximation ratio of the ES percentile mechanism that determines the coordinates of both facilities using the median mechanism. Indeed, by a similar argument used in Theorem 6, we have that the percentile mechanism induced by $V = ((0.5, 0.5), (0.5, 0.5))$ achieves the lowest approximation ratio amongst all the possible ES higher dimensional percentile mechanisms.




Fig. 3: The two Nash Equilibria described in Example 3. The circles represent the agents (agents from 5 to 10 are represented by x_j), the green squares the facilities and the red arrows the strategies played by the agents getting a non-null utility in the two different Nash Equilibria.

Theorem 14 *Let M be the percentile mechanism whose coordinate percentile mechanisms are median mechanisms, then we have that*

$$ar(M) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{2}-1} - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{2}-1} \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2}-1)(k_1+k_2)+1} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{2}-1}, \quad (8)$$

if $k_1, k_2 \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ and

$$ar(M) = \frac{\sqrt{2}(k_2 + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor) + \sqrt{2} - 1}{(\sqrt{2}-1)(k_1+k_2)+1}, \quad (9)$$

otherwise.

Proof Let us consider an instance $\vec{x} = (x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)}) \in ([0, 1]^2)^n$. For the sake of simplicity, we assume n to be odd, so that the median along each coordinate is uniquely determined. Since all the coordinate percentile mechanisms of mechanism M are AIO, the output of the mechanisms places both the facilities at the same location, which we denote with $y = (y_1, y_2) \in [0, 2]^2$. Without loss of generality, let us assume that $0 < y_1, y_2 < 1$ and that at most one agent is located at y . We then have that the set $[0, 1]^2$ is divided into four regions $A_1 = \{x \in [0, 1]^2 \text{ s.t. } x_1 \leq y_1, x_2 \leq y_2\}$, $A_2 = \{x \in [0, 1]^2 \text{ s.t. } x_1 \leq y_1, x_2 > y_2\}$, $A_3 = \{x \in [0, 1]^2 \text{ s.t. } x_1 > y_1, x_2 \leq y_2\}$, and $A_4 = \{x \in [0, 1]^2 \text{ s.t. } x_1 > y_1, x_2 > y_2\}$ (see Figure 4). We denote with \mathcal{A}_i the set containing the agents positions in A_i , that is $\mathcal{A}_i = \{x^{(j)} \text{ s.t. } x^{(j)} \in A_i\}$. By definition of M , we have that $|\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{A}_3| = |\mathcal{A}_2| + |\mathcal{A}_4|$ and $|\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{A}_2| = |\mathcal{A}_3| + |\mathcal{A}_4|$, which implies $|\mathcal{A}_2| = |\mathcal{A}_3|$ and $|\mathcal{A}_1| = |\mathcal{A}_4|$.

Let us now assume that $|\mathcal{A}_2| = |\mathcal{A}_3| = 0$, so that all the agents are located in A_1 and A_4 . Since the number of agents is odd, we then have that the worst-case instance is such that $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ agents are located at $(0, 0)$, $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ agents are located at $(1, 1)$ and one agent is located at $y = (y_1, y_2)$. Notice that if $y_1 + y_2 \neq 1$, we can increase the approximation ratio by moving the facility (and the agent sharing the position with it) to a point of the line $x_1 + x_2 = 1$. Finally,




Fig. 4: The way A_1 , A_2 , A_3 , and A_4 partition of $[0, 1]^2$ in Theorem 14.

we have that the approximation ratio is maximized when either $y = (1, 0)$ or $y = (0, 1)$. Notice that if either $|\mathcal{A}_2|, |\mathcal{A}_3| \neq 0$, we can find an instance such that the Social Welfare of the mechanism is the same while the optimal Social Welfare is equal or larger than the SW of the original instance. Therefore, the worst-case instance for mechanism M is such that $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ agents are located at $(0, 0)$, $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ agents are located at $(1, 1)$, and one agent is located at $(0, 1)$. Notice that the SW induced by the mechanism on this instance is $(\sqrt{2}-1)(k_1+k_2)+1$. To conclude the proof we compute the approximation ratio of the mechanism, to do that we consider two cases.

Case 1: $k_2, k_1 \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. In this case, the optimal SW is equal to k_1+k_2 , thus we infer (8).

Case 2: $k_1 > \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. In this case, the optimal SW is equal to $k_1 + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + (\sqrt{2}-1)$, thus we infer (9) and conclude the thesis. \square

4.3 Beyond $m = 2$ and $d = 2$

To conclude, we briefly comment on the cases in which either we have more than two facilities to locate, *i.e.* $m > 2$, or the agents inhabit a space whose dimension is higher than 2, *i.e.* $d > 2$.

For higher dimensional problems, it is possible to adapt Example 2 and Example 3 to show that the only percentile mechanisms that are ES must be such that $d-1$ coordinates of the mechanisms are AIO mechanisms and the last one is either an AIO mechanism or an SBS mechanism.

When $m > 2$, we have that the results presented in this section still hold: the only percentile mechanisms that are ES either place all the facilities at the same spot or they place the two facilities at two positions whose coordinate differ only in one entry. In the first case, we have that the coordinates of the percentile mechanism are all AIO

mechanisms, in the second case, the coordinates of the mechanism are all AIO except for one coordinate which is an SBS.

5 Experimental Results

In this section, we complement our theoretical study of the m -CFLP with scarce resources by running several numerical experiments. In particular, we want to evaluate the performances of the percentile mechanisms identified by Theorem 5 when the inputs of the mechanisms are generated by a probability distribution. To this extent, we consider two different metrics to assess the efficiency of a mechanism.

The first metric we consider is the Bayesian approximation ratio, which measures how close the expected SW induced by the mechanism and the expected optimal SW are when the agents' positions are samples drawn from a probability distribution μ , [33]. More formally, the Bayesian approximation of $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}$ is

$$B_{ar}(\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}) := \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\vec{X} \sim \mu}[SW_{opt}(\vec{X})]}{\mathbb{E}_{\vec{X} \sim \mu}[SW_{\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}}(\vec{X})]}, \quad (10)$$

where \vec{X} is a n dimensional random vector distributed according to μ .

The second metric we consider is the Average-Case approximation ratio, which measures the average ratio between the optimal Social Welfare and the Social Welfare induced by the mechanism when the agents' positions are samples drawn from a probability distribution μ , [17]. More formally, the Average-Case approximation ratio is defined as

$$AVG_{ar}(\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}) = \mathbb{E}_{\vec{x} \sim \mu} \left[\frac{SW_{opt}(\vec{x})}{SW_{\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{v}}}(\vec{x})} \right]. \quad (11)$$

It is worthy of notice that the Bayesian approximation ratio B_{ar} and the Average-Case approximation ratio AVG_{ar} are two different measures: B_{ar} measures the percentage-loss of the Social Welfare, while the AVG_{ar} measures the average Social Welfare percentage-loss.

Our aim is to show that percentile mechanisms that are optimal according to the worst-case analysis, namely \mathcal{PM}_{best} (see Theorem 5), are optimal or quasi-optimal with respect to both the Bayesian approximation ratio and the Average-Case ratio. For this reason, we run two tests:

- first, we assess to what extent the Bayesian approximation ratio and the Average-Case ratio depend on the percentile vector inducing the percentile mechanism when all the agents are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.). In particular, we compare \mathcal{PM}_{best} with $\mathcal{PM}_{(0,1)}$, that is the percentile mechanism induced by $\vec{v} = (0, 1)$.
- Secondly, we assess the Bayesian approximation ratio and Average-Case ratio of \mathcal{PM}_{best} when diverse agents within the populations follow distinct distributions. This examination helps determine the suitability of \mathcal{PM}_{best} for addressing problems involving non-identically distributed agents.

We run our experiments for different distributions μ and different capacity vectors \vec{k} in order to provide a comprehensive view. Moreover, since the highest approximation

ratio is attained when $m = 2$, we only consider cases in which we need to place two facilities.

Throughout our experiments, we sample the agents' positions from three different probability distributions supported over $[0, 1]$: (i) the uniform distribution, namely \mathcal{U} whose density is equal to 1 over a $[0, 1]$, (ii) the triangular distributions, namely \mathcal{T} , whose density is equal to $2(1 - x)$ over a $[0, 1]$, and (iii) the Beta distributions of parameters $\alpha, \beta > 0$, namely $\mathcal{B}(\alpha, \beta)$ whose density is equal to $Cx^{\alpha-1}(1 - x)^{\beta-1}$ over a $[0, 1]$, where C is a normalizing constant. We consider different capacity vectors \vec{k} . Specifically, we consider balanced capacities $\vec{k} = (k, k)$ and unbalanced capacities $\vec{k} = (k_1, k_2), k_1 > k_2$. For the case of balanced capacities, we consider $k = \alpha n$, where $\alpha = 0.1, 0.2, 0.3$, and 0.4 . For the case of unbalanced capacities, we consider the slightly unbalanced capacities i.e. $\vec{k} = (0.4n, 0.3n)$, and highly unbalanced capacities i.e. $\vec{k} = (0.6n, 0.2n), (0.7n, 0.1n)$. Lastly, for every instance \vec{x} , we do not compute the optimal SW, but rather an upper bound to that quantity. Indeed, the optimal position of the facilities can be any couple of points in $[0, 1]$. Furthermore, to select the optimal facility location we must compute all the NE of every possible facility location and select the one achieving the highest SW. For these reasons, we consider an easier to compute upper bound that is obtained by considering the maximum SW achievable when the mechanism forces agents to use a specific facility, that is

$$SW_{UB}(\vec{x}) := \sup_{y_1, y_2 \in [0, 1]} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \sum_{i \in [n_u]} \sum_{j \in [2]} (1 - |x_i - y_j|) \pi_{i,j} \quad (12)$$

where Π is the set containing all the matching $\pi \subset [n] \times [2]$ such that (i) every $i \in [n]$ has degree that is equal or lower than 1 and (ii) every $j \in [2]$ has degree equal to k_j . This quantity is easy to compute, as the set of optimal positions for the facilities coincides with the positions of the agents.

5.1 Experiment results – Comparing different percentile mechanisms.

In this experiment we want to assess to what degree the percentile vector affects the performances of the percentile mechanisms it induces. For this reason, we compare the empiric Bayesian approximation ratio and the Average-Case approximation ratio of the best percentile mechanism \mathcal{PM}_{best} (identified via Theorem 5), with the respective ratios of a mechanism that places the facilities at the extreme agents' positions. That is, the percentile mechanism induced by the vector $\vec{w} = (0, 1)$, namely $\mathcal{PM}_{(0,1)}$.

We first consider the case of balanced capacities $\vec{k} = (k, k)$. Figure 5 shows the average and the 95% confidence interval (CI) of Bayesian approximation ratio for $n = 10, 20, 30, 40, 50$ when the agents are distributed according to \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{T} . In Figure 6 we plot the results for the Average-Case Ratio under the same settings. Each average is computed over 500 instances. We observe that the percentile mechanism identified in Theorem 5 achieves the a Bayesian approximation ratio that is lower than the one obtained by $\mathcal{PM}_{(0,1)}$ for every value of n . Moreover, the Bayesian approximation ratio of $\mathcal{PM}_{(0,1)}$ consistently increases as the number of agents increases, while the Bayesian




Fig. 5: The Bayesian approximation ratio of \mathcal{PM}_{best} and $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{w}}$ in the balanced case, i.e. $k_1 = k_2$ for $n = 10, 20, \dots, 50$. Every column contains the results for different vector \vec{k} . In the first row, we consider a uniform distribution. In the second row a symmetric Beta, that is $\mathcal{B}(5, 5)$. The third row contains the results for the triangular distribution \mathcal{T} .

approximation ratio of \mathcal{PM}_{best} remains constant regardless of n . Remarkably, these comments hold true even for the Average-Case approximation ratio, showing that the best percentile mechanism is quasi-optimal for both the metrics under study.

We now consider the case in which the facilities have different capacities. Figure 7 shows the average and the 95% confidence interval (CI) of Bayesian approximation ratio for $n = 10, 20, 30, 40, 50$ when the capacities of the two facilities are not balanced, and the agents are distributed according to \mathcal{T} . In Figure 8 we plot the results for




Fig. 6: The Average-Case approximation ratio of \mathcal{PM}_{best} and $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{w}}$ in the balanced case, i.e. $k_1 = k_2$ for $n = 10, 20, \dots, 50$. Every column contains the results for different vector \vec{k} . In the first row, we consider a uniform distribution. In the second row a symmetric Beta, that is $\mathcal{B}(5, 5)$. The third row contains the results for the triangular distribution \mathcal{T} .

the Average-Case Ratio under the same settings. More specifically, we consider $\vec{k} = (0.4n, 0.3n)$ and $(0.7n, 0.1n)$. We observe that the percentile mechanism identified by Theorem 5 has a lower and more stable Bayesian approximation ratio, highlighting how choosing a percentile vector affects the average performances of the mechanism. The same holds for the Average-Case approximation ratio.




Fig. 7: The Bayesian approximation ratio of \mathcal{PM}_{best} and $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{w}}$ when the agents are distributed according to \mathcal{T} and the facilities are unbalanced, i.e. $k_1 = \alpha_1 n \neq k_2 = \alpha_2 n$ for $n = 10, 20, \dots, 50$. Every column contains the results for different vector \vec{k} . The first row contains the results for a symmetric Beta distribution, that is $\mathcal{B}(5, 5)$. The second row contains the results for the triangular distribution \mathcal{T} . The last row contains the results for the Uniform distribution \mathcal{U} .

5.2 Experiment results – Bayesian approximation ratio for non i.i.d. populations.

In this test, we empirically evaluate the Bayesian approximation ratio of the percentile mechanisms identified by Theorem 5 when agents are not identically distributed. In particular, we consider the case in which each agent of the population is distributed according to \mathcal{U} , \mathcal{T} , and $\mathcal{B}(5, 5)$. Every instance is identified by the percentages of agents following each distributions, hence we set $\Lambda = (\lambda_U, \lambda_B, \lambda_T)$, where $\lambda_U = \frac{n_U}{n}$,




Fig. 8: The Average-Case approximation ratio of \mathcal{PM}_{best} and $\mathcal{PM}_{\vec{w}}$ when the agents are distributed according to \mathcal{T} and the facilities are unbalanced, i.e. $k_1 = \alpha_1 n \neq k_2 = \alpha_2 n$ for $n = 10, 20, \dots, 50$. Every column contains the results for different vector \vec{k} . The first row contains the results for a symmetric Beta distribution, that is $\mathcal{B}(5, 5)$. The second row contains the results for the triangular distribution \mathcal{T} . The last row contains the results for the Uniform distribution \mathcal{U} .

$\lambda_B = \frac{n_B}{n}$, and $\lambda_T = \frac{n_T}{n}$, n is the total number of agents, and n_U , n_B , and n_T are the number of agents following the uniform, Beta, and Triangular distribution, respectively.

In Figure 9, we report our results for different vectors Λ . We consider the case in which the capacities of the facilities are balanced, that $k_1 = k_2 = \lfloor \alpha n \rfloor$, where $\alpha = 0.1, 0.2$, and 0.3 . From our experiments we observe that the percentile mechanism achieves an almost optimal Bayesian approximation ratio (peaking at 1.01), that it is constant




Fig. 9: The Bayesian approximation ratio of \mathcal{PM}_{best} for a population non i.i.d.. The capacities of the facilities are balanced, i.e. $k_1 = k_2 = \alpha n$ with $\alpha = 0.1, 0.2, 0.3$, and for $n = 10, 20, \dots, 50$. In the first row, the Beta distribution is symmetric, in particular $\mathcal{B}(5, 5)$, in the second row the Beta distribution is asymmetric, in particular $\mathcal{B}(1, 9)$. Every column contains the results for different Λ .

regardless of n , and that the CI is small (around 0.003). Our experiments confirm that the best percentile mechanism according to the worst-case analysis behave almost optimally in a Bayesian framework.

In Figure 10, we report our results for the Average-Case approximation ratio. We observe that, while the expected approximation ratio of the mechanism is still low and close to 1, the confidence interval in this case is tighter, which further confirms the suitability of the percentile mechanism to handle instances in which the population is non identically distributed.

6 Conclusion and Future Works

In this paper, we studied the mechanism design aspects of the m -CFLP under the assumption that the total capacity of the facility is smaller than the number of agents to accommodate. We assume that, after the position of the facility is fixed, the agents compete in a First-Come-First-Served (FCFS) game to gain access to the facilities. Our main contribution consist in studying the case in which $m \geq 2$, which was left as an open questions in the paper introducing the problem [2]. Our approach emphasizes the significance of absolutely truthful mechanisms, which prevent agents from benefiting regardless of their strategy in the FCFS game, and ES mechanisms, whose




Fig. 10: The Average-Case approximation ratio of \mathcal{PM}_{best} for a population non i.d.. The capacities of the facilities are balanced, i.e. $k_1 = k_2 = \alpha n$ with $\alpha = 0.1, 0.2, 0.3$, and for $n = 10, 20, \dots, 50$. In the first row, the Beta distribution is symmetric, in particular $\mathcal{B}(5, 5)$, in the second row the Beta distribution is asymmetric, in particular $\mathcal{B}(1, 9)$. Every column contains the results for different Λ .

SW remains independent of the FCFS game equilibrium. We show that the percentile mechanisms [13] are absolutely truthful and characterize under which conditions they are ES. We show that ES percentile mechanisms achieve bounded approximation ratio for every $m > 1$ and characterize the best percentile vector as a function of n , k_1 , and k_2 . Interestingly, if $n > (2k - 1)m$, the approximation ratio of the best percentile mechanism $1 + \frac{1}{2m-1}$, i.e. is asymptotically optimal with respect to the number of facilities. Lastly, we run extensive numerical results to study the performances of the percentile mechanism from a Bayesian perspective.

In our future works, we aim at extending this problem to the case in which the agents are located on a generic graph. Another interesting research avenue is to study how changing the preferences of the agents affects the performances of the mechanisms. Finally, it would be interesting to study the asymptotic Bayesian approximation ratio of ES percentile mechanisms. In that regard, it is worth to notice that the upper bound we presented in (12) can be connected to the truncated Wasserstein Distance presented in [34, 35], which enables to apply the same techniques developed in [32].

Acknowledgements

Jie Zhang was partially supported by a Leverhulme Trust Research Project Grant (2021 – 2024) and the EPSRC grant (EP/W014912/1).

References

- [1] Auricchio, G., Clough, H.J., Zhang, J.: On the capacitated facility location problem with scarce resources. In: The 40th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (2024). <https://openreview.net/forum?id=3tH7YyFTs>
- [2] Aziz, H., Chan, H., Lee, B.E., Parkes, D.C.: The capacity constrained facility location problem. *Games and Economic Behavior* **124**, 478–490 (2020)
- [3] Brimberg, J., Korach, E., Eben-Chaim, M., Mehrez, A.: The capacitated p-facility location problem on the real line. *International Transactions in Operational Research* **8**(6), 727–738 (2001)
- [4] Pal, M., Tardos, T., Wexler, T.: Facility location with nonuniform hard capacities. In: Proceedings 42nd IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, pp. 329–338. IEEE, New York (2001)
- [5] Aardal, K., Berg, P.L., Gijswijt, D., Li, S.: Approximation algorithms for hard capacitated k-facility location problems. *European Journal of Operational Research* **242**(2), 358–368 (2015)
- [6] Balci, B., Beamon, B.M.: Facility location in humanitarian relief. *International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications* **11**(2), 101–121 (2008)
- [7] Melo, M.T., Nickel, S., Saldanha-da-Gama, F.: Facility location and supply chain management – a review. *European Journal of Operational Research* **196**(2), 401–412 (2009)
- [8] Ahmadi-Javid, A., Seyedi, P., Syam, S.S.: A survey of healthcare facility location. *Computers & Operations Research* **79**, 223–263 (2017)
- [9] Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., Friedman, J.H., Friedman, J.H.: *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction* vol. 2. Springer, Berlin (2009)
- [10] Auricchio, G., Bassetti, F., Gualandi, S., Veneroni, M.: Computing wasserstein barycenters via linear programming. In: International Conference on Integration of Constraint Programming, Artificial Intelligence, and Operations Research, pp. 355–363 (2019). Springer
- [11] Barda, O.H., Dupuis, J., Lencioni, P.: Multicriteria location of thermal power plants. *European Journal of Operational Research* **45**(2-3), 332–346 (1990)
- [12] Nisan, N., Ronen, A.: Algorithmic mechanism design. In: Proceedings of the Thirty-first Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, pp. 129–140. ACM, New York (1999)

- [13] Sui, X., Boutilier, C., Sandholm, T.: Analysis and optimization of multi-dimensional percentile mechanisms. In: IJCAI, pp. 367–374. AAAI press, Washington (2013). Citeseer
- [14] Walsh, T.: Strategy proof mechanisms for facility location in euclidean and manhattan space. arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.07983 (2020)
- [15] Fotakis, D., Tzamos, C.: On the power of deterministic mechanisms for facility location games. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation (TEAC)* **2**(4), 1–37 (2014)
- [16] Hartline, J.D., Roughgarden, T.: Simple versus optimal mechanisms. In: Proceedings of the 10th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce, pp. 225–234. ACM, New York (2009)
- [17] Deng, X., Gao, Y., Zhang, J.: Beyond the worst-case analysis of random priority: Smoothed and average-case approximation ratios in mechanism design. *Inf. Comput.* **285**(Part), 104920 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IC.2022.104920>
- [18] Procaccia, A.D., Tennenholtz, M.: Approximate mechanism design without money. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation (TEAC)* **1**(4), 1–26 (2013)
- [19] Filos-Ratsikas, A., Li, M., Zhang, J., Zhang, Q.: Facility location with double-peaked preferences. *Auton. Agents Multi Agent Syst.* **31**(6), 1209–1235 (2017) <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10458-017-9361-0>
- [20] Feldman, M., Wilf, Y.: Strategyproof facility location and the least squares objective. In: EC, pp. 873–890. ACM, New York (2013)
- [21] Filimonov, A., Meir, R.: Strategyproof facility location mechanisms on discrete trees. In: AAMAS, pp. 510–518. ACM, New York (2021)
- [22] Lu, P., Sun, X., Wang, Y., Zhu, Z.A.: Asymptotically optimal strategy-proof mechanisms for two-facility games. In: EC, pp. 315–324. ACM, New York (2010)
- [23] Lu, P., Wang, Y., Zhou, Y.: Tighter bounds for facility games. In: WINE. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 5929, pp. 137–148. Springer, Berlin (2009)
- [24] Alon, N., Feldman, M., Procaccia, A.D., Tennenholtz, M.: Strategyproof approximation of the minimax on networks. *Mathematics of Operations Research* **35**(3), 513–526 (2010)
- [25] Dokow, E., Feldman, M., Meir, R., Nehama, I.: Mechanism design on discrete lines and cycles. In: EC, pp. 423–440. ACM, New York (2012)
- [26] Meir, R.: Strategyproof facility location for three agents on a circle. In: SAGT. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 11801, pp. 18–33. Springer, Berlin (2019)

- [27] Tang, P., Yu, D., Zhao, S.: Characterization of group-strategyproof mechanisms for facility location in strictly convex space. In: EC, pp. 133–157. ACM, New York (2020)
- [28] Chan, H., Filos-Ratsikas, A., Li, B., Li, M., Wang, C.: Mechanism design for facility location problems: a survey. arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.03457 (2021)
- [29] Aziz, H., Chan, H., Lee, B., Li, B., Walsh, T.: Facility location problem with capacity constraints: Algorithmic and mechanism design perspectives. In: Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, vol. 34, pp. 1806–1813. MIT Press, New York (2020)
- [30] Walsh, T.: Strategy proof mechanisms for facility location with capacity limits. In: Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-22, pp. 527–533. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, Massachusetts (2022)
- [31] Auricchio, G., Wang, Z., Zhang, J.: Facility location problems with capacity constraints: Two facilities and beyond. In: IJCAI 24 (to Appear). ijcai.org, ??? (2024)
- [32] Auricchio, G., Zhang, J., Zhang, M.: Extended ranking mechanisms for the m-capacitated facility location problem in bayesian mechanism design. In: Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, AAMAS 24 (to Appear) (2024)
- [33] Hartline, J.D., Lucier, B.: Bayesian algorithmic mechanism design. In: Proceedings of the Forty-second ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. STOC '10. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2010)
- [34] Pele, O., Werman, M.: Fast and robust Earth Mover’s Distances. In: Computer Vision, 2009 IEEE 12th International Conference On, pp. 460–467 (2009). IEEE
- [35] Auricchio, G., Gualandi, S., Veneroni, M.: The maximum nearby flow problem. Advances in Optimization and Decision Science for Society, Services and Enterprises: ODS, Genoa, Italy, September 4-7, 2019, 23–33 (2019)