

Polyhedral Clinching Auctions for Indivisible Goods

Hiroshi Hirai*

Ryosuke Sato †

March 14, 2023

Abstract

In this study, we propose polyhedral clinching auctions for indivisible goods, which has so far been studied for divisible goods. As in the divisible setting by Goel et al., our mechanism enjoys incentive compatibility, individual rationality, and Pareto optimality, and works with polymatroidal environments. A notable feature for the indivisible setting is that the whole procedure can be conducted in time polynomial of the number of buyers and goods. Moreover, we show additional efficiency guarantees, recently established by Sato for the divisible setting, that the liquid welfare (LW) of our mechanism achieves more than $1/2$ of the optimal LW, and that the social welfare is more than the optimal LW.

1 Introduction

The theoretical foundation for budget-constrained auctions is an avoidable step toward further social implementation of auction theory. A representative example is ad auctions (e.g., Edelman et al. [8]), where advertisers naturally have budgets for their advertising costs. However, it is well known [5, 6] that designing auctions with budget constraints is a theoretically difficult task: Any budget-feasible mechanism cannot achieve the desirable goal of satisfying all of incentive compatibility (IC), individual rationality (IR), and constant approximation to the optimal social welfare (SW).

In the case where budgets are public, Dobzinski et al. [5] proposed a budget-feasible mechanism that builds on the clinching framework of Ausubel [1]. Their mechanism satisfies IC, IR, and Pareto Optimality (PO), a weaker notion of efficiency than SW. They also showed that their mechanism is the only budget-feasible mechanism satisfying IC, IR, and PO. Their results have inspired further research [4, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15] for extending their mechanism to various settings.

Polyhedral clinching auction by Goel et al. [13] is the most outstanding of these, and can even be applied to complex environments expressed by polymatroids. Indeed, their mechanism is a clever fusion of auction theory and polymatroid theory. This has brought further extensions, such as concave budget constraints [12] and two-sided markets [15, 21]. Particularly, a recent result by Sato [21] established a new type of efficiency guarantees in the mechanism. We thus believe that the polyhedral clinching auction will be a standard framework for the theory of budget-constrained auctions.

These results of the polyhedral clinching auction are all restricted to auctions of divisible goods, though many auctions deal with indivisible goods. In this study, we address the polyhedral clinching auction for indivisible goods to enlarge its power of applicability.

*Department of Mathematical Informatics, Graduate School of Information Science and Technology, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan. hirai@mist.i.u-tokyo.ac.jp

†Department of Mathematical Informatics, Graduate School of Information Science and Technology, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan. ryosuke-sato-517@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Our Contributions

We propose the polyhedral clinching auction for indivisible goods, based on the framework of the one for divisible goods in Goel et al. [13]. Our mechanism exhibits the desirable properties expected from their mechanism. That is, it satisfies IC, IR, and PO and works with polymatroidal environments. This means that it is also applicable to a wide range of auctions, such as multi-unit auctions in Dobzinski et al. [5], matching markets in Fiat et al. [9], ad slot auctions in Colini-Baldeschi et al. [4], and video-on-demand in Bikhchandani et al. [3]. In addition, a promising future research is the two-sided extensions of our results, as already proceeded for the divisible settings in Hirai and Sato [15] and Sato [21]. Particularly, a natural two-sided extension of our model captures the reservation exchange markets in Goel et al. [11] — a setting of two-sided markets for display advertisements.

As in the divisible setting in [13], each iteration of our mechanism can be done in polynomial time. A notable feature specific to the indivisible setting is its iteration complexity. The total number of the iterations is also polynomially bounded in the number of buyers and the goods. Thus, the whole procedure can be conducted in polynomial time.

For efficiency, in addition to the above PO, we establish two types of recently invented guarantees. The first one is that our mechanism achieves liquid welfare (LW) more than $1/2$ of the optimal LW. This is the first LW guarantee for clinching auctions with indivisible goods. Here LW [6, 23] is a payment-based efficiency measure for budget-constrained auctions, and is defined as the sum of the total admissibility-to-pay, which is the minimum of valuation of the allocated goods (willingness-to-pay) and budget (ability-to-pay). This efficiency guarantee was recently established by Sato [21] for the divisible setting, of which our result is placed as an indivisible and one-sided version. Other existing study [6] on LW guarantees for clinching auctions is only limited to simple settings of multiunit auctions. It is notable that the above 2-approximation holds for more general auctions with polymatroid constraints.

The second one is that our mechanism achieves SW more than the optimal LW. This type of efficiency guarantee comparing SW of mechanisms with the optimal LW is recently proposed by Sato [21] based on the following motivation: In budget-constrained auctions, modifying the valuations to make the market non-budgeted is often considered; see, e.g., Lehmann et al. [18]. If each buyer’s valuation is modified to the budget-additive valuation, then LW is interpreted as the SW. In this approach, the optimal LW is used as the target value of SW and can be thought as a reasonable benchmark of SW. Thus, this guarantee provides another evidence for high efficiency of our mechanism.

Technical difficulties preventing straightforward generalizations of the previous are caused by effects of the indivisibility of goods. We overcome these difficulties as follows: We sharpen the *tight sets lemma* for indivisible settings. The tight sets lemma [12, 13] characterizes the situation of buyers dropping the auction, and is an indispensable technical tool in analysis of the polyhedral clinching auctions. In contrast to the divisible setting [13], in our mechanism, buyers can drop from the auction without exhausting their budget. To deal with this case, we utilize the notion of the “dropping price” [12], which was developed for more general budget constraints. Our tight sets lemma also strengthens the “no trading path properties” in Fiat et al. [9] and Colini-Baldeschi et al. [4], which was used for PO guarantee arguments in their clinching auctions for indivisible goods.

Using our tight sets lemma, we obtain the above efficiency guarantees. The most nontrivial part is to obtain the LW guarantee. For this, we devise a novel comparison technique: Divide each buyer into two “virtual buyers” and construct an LW maximizing allocation for the virtual buyers. Then, we link this virtual allocation to the real allocation produced by our mechanism and obtain a lower bound on LW.

Other Related Works

Auctions of indivisible goods are ubiquitous in the real-world. For unbudgeted settings, its theory already has a wealth of knowledge; see, e.g., Krishna [16] and Nisan et al. [20]. Auctions with (poly)matroid constraints are initiated by Bikhchandani et al. [3]. They considered buyers who have concave valuations and no budget limits. A budgeted extension of their framework is captured by our framework if all buyers have additive valuations within their budgets. For budgeted auctions, Dobzinski et al. [5] proposed the adaptive clinching auction and showed that it has IC, IR, and PO. Later, Fiat et al. [9] and Colini-Baldeschi et al. [4] extended their mechanism to a market represented by a bipartite graph, that is a typical case of polymatroidal environments.

LW was introduced independently and simultaneously by Dobzinski and Leme [6] and Syrgkanis and Tardos [23]. The existing LW guarantees for auctions with public budgets are as follows: For clinching auctions, Dobzinski and Leme [6] showed that the adaptive clinching auction in Dobzinski et al. [5] achieves 2-approximation to the optimal LW. Recently, Sato [21] revealed that the polyhedral clinching auction in Hirai and Sato [15] achieves 2-approximation to the optimal LW even under polymatroidal constraints. Our results are viewed as an indivisible and one-sided version of his results. For unit price auctions, Dobzinski and Leme [6] also revealed that their unit price auction achieves 2-approximation to the optimal LW. Later, Lu and Xiao [19] proposed another unit price auction and improved the guarantee to $(1+\sqrt{5})/2$. It is an interesting research direction to incorporate polymatroidal constraints with their mechanisms, for which our results may help.

Notation

Let \mathbb{R}_+ (resp. \mathbb{Z}_+) denote the set of nonnegative real numbers (resp. integers), and let \mathbb{Z}_{++} denote the set of positive integers. For a set N , let \mathbb{R}_+^N (resp. \mathbb{Z}_+^N) denote the set of all functions from N to \mathbb{R}_+ (resp. \mathbb{Z}_+). For $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, we often denote $x(i)$ by x_i , and write it as $x = (x_i)_{i \in N}$. Let $x(S)$ denote the sum of $x(i)$ over $i \in S$, i.e., $x(S) := \sum_{i \in S} x(i)$. In addition, we often denote a singleton $\{i\}$ by i . For a function $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, we call f integer-valued if $f(S) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for each $S \subseteq N$.

Let us briefly recall the basic facts of polymatroid theory. A polymatroid $P(f)$ is a polytope defined by $P(f) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^N : x(S) \leq f(S) \text{ } (S \subseteq N)\}$, where $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ represents the corresponding monotone submodular function satisfying (i) $f(\emptyset) = 0$, (ii) $f(S) \leq f(T)$ for each $S \subseteq T$, and (iii) $f(S) + f(T) \geq f(S \cap T) + f(S \cup T)$. We often denote $P(f)$ by P . For a polymatroid P , and vectors $x \in P$ and $d \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, we define $P_{x,d}$ by

$$P_{x,d} := \{y \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N \mid x + y \in P, y \leq d\}. \quad (1)$$

Then, $P_{x,d}$ is a polymatroid again because it is obtained through contraction by x and reduction by $x + d$ for polymatroid P . The monotone submodular function $f_{x,d}$ corresponding to $P_{x,d}$ is defined by

$$f_{x,d}(S) := \min_{T \subseteq S} \{ \min_{T' \supseteq T} \{f(T') - x(T')\} + d(S \setminus T) \}, \quad (2)$$

see Section 3.1 of Fujishige [10]. Thus, if f is integer-valued and $x, d \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$, then so is $f_{x,d}$.

Organization of this paper

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce our model. In Section 3, we propose our mechanism and provide some basic properties. In Section 4, we analyze the structure of our mechanism and obtain the tight sets lemma. In Section 5, we provide the efficiency guarantees for our mechanism with respect to PO, LW, and SW.

2 Our Model

Consider a market with multiple buyers and a seller who plays the role of the auctioneer. The seller auctions multiple units of homogeneous and indivisible goods. Let $N := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ be a set of buyers. Buyer $i \in N$ has a single-valued valuation $v_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ for one unit of the goods, which is private information unknown to other buyers and the seller. Further, the buyer has a budget of $B_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$, which is the maximum total payment that the buyer can pay in the auction. Each buyer reports their bid $v'_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ for one unit and the seller determines the allocation based on a predetermined mechanism.

The allocation $\mathcal{A} := (x, p)$ is a pair of $x \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}^N$, where x represents the number of indivisible goods allocated to the buyers, and p represents the payments of buyers for their goods. Then, the budget constraints are described as $p_i \leq B_i$ ($i \in N$). We are given a monotone submodular function $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ that represents the feasible allocation of goods. For any set of buyers $S \subseteq N$, the buyers in S can transact at most $f(S)$ amounts of goods through the auction¹. This condition is equivalent to $x \in P$ using the polymatroid P defined by f . Moreover, we assume $f(N) = f(N \setminus i)$ for each $i \in N$, which implies that competition exists among buyers for each good at the beginning.

The utilities of the buyers are defined by

$$u_i(\mathcal{A}) := \begin{cases} v_i x_i - p_i & \text{if } p_i \leq B_i, \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus, the utilities of the buyers are quasi-linear if the budget constraints are satisfied, and otherwise, the utilities go to $-\infty$. The utility of the seller is defined as the revenue of the seller, i.e., $u_s(\mathcal{A}) := \sum_{i \in N} p_i$. The mechanism is a map $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ from information \mathcal{I} to allocation \mathcal{A} . Note that \mathcal{I} includes all information that the seller can access, and thus $\mathcal{I} = (N, \{v'_i\}_{i \in N}, \{B_i\}_{i \in N}, f)$. We call a mechanism \mathcal{M} budget feasible if, for any \mathcal{I} , mechanism \mathcal{M} outputs an allocation that satisfies the budget constraints.

Our goal is to design an efficient budget feasible mechanism \mathcal{M} that satisfies incentive compatibility (IC) and individual rationality (IR). A mechanism satisfies IC if for any $(\mathcal{I}, \{v_i\}_{i \in N})$, it holds $u_i(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{I}_i)) \geq u_i(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{I}))$ for each $i \in N$, where \mathcal{I}_i denotes the information obtained from \mathcal{I} by replacing v'_i with v_i . Thus, the best strategy for each buyer is to report their true valuation. When the mechanism satisfies IC, it satisfies IR if, for any $(\mathcal{I}, \{v_i\}_{i \in N})$, $u_i(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{I}_i)) \geq 0$ for each $i \in N$. Therefore, each buyer obtains nonnegative utility when the buyer reports the true valuation.

The efficiency of the mechanism can be evaluated by the followings: Social welfare (SW) is defined as the sum of the valuations of the allocated goods for all buyers, and it can be interpreted as the sum of the utilities of all participants. In other words, $\text{SW}(\mathcal{A}) := \sum_{i \in N} v_i x_i = \sum_{i \in N} u_i(\mathcal{A}) + u_s(\mathcal{A})$. This is the standard efficiency measure used for the auctions. However, a good approximation cannot be obtained with budget constraints:

Lemma 2.1 (e.g. Dobzinski and Leme [6]). For every $\alpha < n$, there is no budget feasible mechanism that achieves α -approximation to the optimal SW, with IC and IR.

The alternative measure for budget-constrained auctions is LW, which is defined by $\text{LW}(\mathcal{A}) := \sum_{i \in N} \min(v_i x_i, B_i)$ for allocation \mathcal{A} . LW represents the sum of the possible payments that buyers can pay for their allocated goods. Another type of efficiency guarantee suitable for budget constraints is Pareto optimality (PO). A mechanism satisfies PO if for any $(\mathcal{I}, \{v_i\}_{i \in N})$, there is no other allocation \mathcal{A}' with (i) $u_i(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{I})) \geq u_i(\mathcal{A}')$ for each $i \in N$, (ii) $u_s(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{I})) \geq u_s(\mathcal{A}')$, and (iii) at least one inequality holds without equality. This implies that there is no mechanism superior to the mechanism.

¹Note that $f(N)$ means the total goods sold in the auction.

3 Polyhedral Clinching Auctions for Indivisible Goods

In this section, we describe our mechanism. We provide a brief overview of the mechanism and present a full description in Algorithm 1. The initial values of an allocation (x, p) are all zero. These values are updated when buyers clinch some amount of goods in each iteration. In addition, we use price clock c whose value is initially zero and increases at the beginning of each iteration in line 3. The demand d_i of buyer i represents the maximum possible amount of i 's transaction at the current price. The initial demand d_i is set to $f(i) + 1$ for each $i \in N$ ², and when price clock c is updated, the demand d_i is also updated to

$$d_i := \begin{cases} \min\{\tilde{d}_i, \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \lfloor \frac{B_i - p_i}{c + \varepsilon} \rfloor\} & \text{if } c < v'_i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

in the iteration, where \tilde{d}_i represents the demand of buyer i just before the price update.

The definition of d_i indicates that, when the demand of buyer i decreases, c is equal to v'_i or c is slightly increased from the state of $d_i = (B_i - p_i)/c \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$. In the former case, the demand for buyer i decreases to zero, and in the latter case, the demand for buyer i decreases by one. In both cases, if the condition described below is satisfied after the demand update, the buyers clinch some amount of goods. Subsequently, the allocation (x, p) and the demands d are updated. After processing both cases, Algorithm 1 terminates and outputs the final allocation (x^f, p^f) if the demand of all buyers is zero. Otherwise, the next iteration is performed.

The calculation in line 3 is explained as follows: For each i , the next price at which the demand changes is $\min\{v'_i, (B_i - p_i)/\tilde{d}_i\}$, where \tilde{d} represents the demand immediately before line 3. This is because if $c = v'_i$, then the demand for buyer i decreases to zero in line 5, and if $(B_i - p_i)/\tilde{d}_i = c$, then $(B_i - p_i)/c = \tilde{d}_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, and thus the demand for buyer i decreases by one in line 9. Therefore, the next price in line 3 is calculated by $\min_{i \in X} \min\{v'_i, (B_i - p_i)/\tilde{d}_i\}$, where X denotes the set of active buyers, i.e., $X := \{i \in N \mid d_i > 0\}$.

Algorithm 1 Polyhedral Clinching Auction for Indivisible Goods

- 1: $x_i = 0, p_i := 0, d_i := f(i) + 1$ ($i \in N$) and $c := 0$.
 - 2: **while** $d_i \neq 0$ for some $i \in N$ **do**
 - 3: Raise c up to the price at which there exists a buyer with decreasing demand.
 - 4: **for** $i' \in \{i \mid v'_i = c\}$ **do**
 - 5: $d_{i'} := 0$
 - 6: Clinching(f, x, p, d, c)
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: **for** $i' \in \{i \mid v'_i \neq c, d_i = \frac{B_i - p_i}{c} \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}\}$ **do**
 - 9: $d_{i'} := d_{i'} - 1$
 - 10: Clinching(f, x, p, d, c)
 - 11: **end for**
 - 12: **end while**
 - 13: Output $(x^f, p^f) := (x, p)$.
-

The clinching steps in lines 6 and 10 are described in Algorithm 2. Let x and d be the current allocation of goods and demands, respectively, just before the execution of Algorithm 2 in a certain iteration. We define two polytopes that represent the feasible transactions of buyers to illustrate the

²According to this definition and the polymatroid constraint, no one drops without decreasing the demand in lines 5 and 9 by $f(i) + 1 \geq x_i + 1$. By this property, we can clearly describe the tight sets lemma (Theorem 4.9).

clinchng condition. Recall the notation $P_{x,d}$ in equation (1). Polytope $P_{x,d}$ represents the remnant supply polytope that indicates the feasible transaction of buyers from the current iteration. In addition, $P_{x,d}^i(w_i)$ represents a feasible transaction of buyers $N \setminus i$ when buyer i clinches $w_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ units of goods. Mathematically, $P_{x,d}^i(w_i)$ is defined by $P_{x,d}^i(w_i) := \{w_{-i} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{N \setminus i} \mid (w_i, w_{-i}) \in P_{x,d}\}$. The clinching condition is then described by

$$\delta_i = \sup\{w_i \geq 0 \mid P_{x,d}^i(w_i) = P_{x,d}^i(0)\}.$$

Thus, buyer i clinches the maximal possible amount δ_i , not affecting the feasible transactions of other buyers $N \setminus i$. This clinching condition is consistent with the clinching condition in other studies [1, 2, 4, 7, 5, 9, 12, 13, 14].

Algorithm 2 Clinching (f, x, p, c, d)

- 1: **for** $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ **do**
 - 2: Clinch a maximal increase $\delta_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ satisfying $P_{x,d}^i(\delta_i) = P_{x,d}^i(0)$
 - 3: $x_i := x_i + \delta_i$, $p_i := p_i + c\delta_i$, $d_i := d_i - \delta_i$
 - 4: **end for**
-

$P_{x,d}$ and $P_{x,d}^i(w_i)$ are known to be polymatroids. Using the polymatroid theory, the monotone submodular function $f_{x,d}$ that defines $P_{x,d}$ can be described by equation (2). However, Sato [21] pointed out that $f_{x,d}$ can be described more clearly in their polyhedral clinching auction for divisible goods. We demonstrate that this result can also be applied to our mechanism. The proof is similar to that of Sato [21], and is thus provided in Appendix A.

Theorem 3.1. For any $S \subseteq N$, it holds $f_{x,d}(S) = \min_{S' \subseteq S} \{f(S') - x(S') + d(S \setminus S')\}$.

Theorem 3.1 is useful for analyzing our mechanism. For instance, δ can be computed as follows:

Proposition 3.2. In Algorithm 2, it holds $\delta_i = f_{x,d}(N) - f_{x,d}(N \setminus i)$ for each $i \in N$.

The proof is also provided in Appendix A. Proposition 3.2 indicates that, provided the value oracle of f , the value δ_i can be computed in polynomial time by a submodular minimization algorithm, such as in Lee et al. [17]. In addition, Proposition 3.2 implies that the amount of goods allocated to each buyer in Algorithm 2 is independent of the buyers' order.

We investigate the properties of our mechanism in the following. To this end, we fixed the input (\mathcal{I}, v) . The basic concept of our mechanism is similar to that proposed by Goel et al. [13], and our mechanism inherits several desirable properties.

We begin with the following theorem:

Theorem 3.3. Our mechanism is budget feasible and satisfies IC and IR.

For the proof of budget feasibility, we need the following lemma, which is also used in the subsequent proofs. The proof of the following lemma is provided in Appendix A.

Lemma 3.4. It holds $x_i \geq \lceil \frac{p_i}{c} \rceil$ for each $i \in N$. In particular, if $c < v_i$, it holds $d_i \geq \max\left(\frac{B_i - p_i}{c} - 1, \left\lfloor \frac{B_i - p_i}{c'} \right\rfloor\right) \geq 0$ for any c' with $c' > c$.

Proof of Theorem 3.3. In Algorithm 1, it holds throughout the auction that $B_i - p_i \geq 0$ for each $i \in N$ by Lemma 3.4. Therefore, our mechanism is budget feasible. For each buyer i , the bid v'_i is used to only determine when the buyer i drops. If $v'_i < v_i$, buyer i may miss some goods at a price below

their valuation. In addition, if $v'_i > v_i$, buyer i may clinch some goods at a price greater than their valuation. Then, truthful bidding is the best strategy for buyers, and therefore our mechanism satisfies IC. The mechanism satisfies IR because each buyer clinches goods at a price lower than the buyer's valuation if $v'_i = v_i$. \square

From Theorem 3.3, our mechanism satisfies IC, and therefore, we assume in the rest of the paper that all buyers bid truthfully, that is, $v'_i = v_i$ for every $i \in N$.

The following proposition indicates that our mechanism sells all goods to the buyers.

Proposition 3.5. At the end of the auction, it holds $x^f(N) = f(N)$.

The proof is provided in Appendix A. These four properties also hold in the polyhedral clinching auction for the divisible case by Goel et al. [13]. We consider the properties specific to our setting: There are two differences between our mechanism and that in [13].

The first is on buyer's demand: The demands must be an integer vector because our model deals with indivisible goods. Thus, the demand for fewer than one unit is rounded down, which makes δ an integer vector in each iteration.

Proposition 3.6. In Algorithm 2, it holds $\delta_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ for each $i \in N$.

Proof. We prove that $f_{x,d}$ is integer-valued throughout the auction. Then, by Proposition 3.2, it holds $\delta_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ for each $i \in N$, as required. At the beginning of the auction, the initial values of x and d are integers. Since f is integer-valued, so is $f_{x,d}$.

After the demand update in lines 5 and 9, suppose that both x and d remain integer vectors. Then, $f_{x,d}$ is again integer-valued. During the execution of Algorithm 2, by Proposition 3.2, δ_i represents an integer for each $i \in N$. Then, x is updated to $x_i = x_i + \delta_i$ and d is updated to $d_i = d_i - \delta_i$ for each $i \in N$. This means that x and d remain integer vectors. Thus, in each iteration, x and d are integer vectors, and thus $f_{x,d}$ is integer-valued since f is integer-valued. \square

The second is on price update: Our mechanism sets a common price for all buyers and does not use a fixed step size for price increases. This is based on the idea of Bikhchandani et al. [3] and Fiat et al. [9], and it plays an essential role in the iteration bounds; therefore, in the computational complexity. In our mechanism, the total sum of initial demands is $\sum_{i \in N} f(i) + n$, and in each iteration, it is guaranteed that the total sum of the demands is decreased by at least one. Therefore, we have the following:

Proposition 3.7. Our mechanism terminates after at most $\sum_{i \in N} f(i) + n$ iterations.

Note that it holds $\sum_{i \in N} f(i) + n \leq n(f(N) + 1)$ based on the monotonicity of f . Further, as stated above, each iteration can be computed using the submodular minimization algorithm [17], which has runtime polynomial in the number of n , provided the value oracle of f is given. Therefore, our mechanism can be computed in polynomial time.

4 Structures of the Mechanism

We now investigate the efficiency of our mechanism. To this end, we devise the structures of the tight sets lemma (*tight sets lemma*) for our model and mechanism. This lemma is originally derived by Goel et al. [12, 13] for their mechanism and is useful for analyzing the efficiency of clinching auctions.

Let x and d be the current allocation of goods and demands in a certain iteration of Algorithm 1. Throughout this section, for any demand vector $d \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$, we define d^{-i} by $d^{-i} := (0, d_{-i})$, where $d_{-i} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{N \setminus i}$ denotes the demands of buyers $N \setminus i$. Then, from equation (2), the following immediately holds because $f_{x,d}(S \setminus i)$ is independent of d_i :

Observation 4.1. It holds $f_{x,d}(S \setminus i) = f_{x,d-i}(S \setminus i)$ for any $S \ni i$.

4.1 Unsaturation

We analyze invariant properties that hold throughout the auction using the notion of “unsaturation”, which is a binary relation introduced by Goel et al. [12]. All the properties also hold for the setting of Goel et al. [12], and the proofs in this subsection are provided in Appendix B. We begin by the definition of unsaturation.

Definition 4.2 (Goel et al. [12]). Fix a buyer k . Buyer i is k -unsaturated if all optimal solutions to $\max_{z \in P_{x,d-k}} \mathbf{1}^t z$ satisfy $z_i = d_i^{-k}$. We say that buyer i is k -saturated if buyer i is not k -unsaturated.

The binary relation “ i is k -unsaturated” is denoted by “ $i \lesssim k$ ”. When considering a binary relation, it is often useful to examine the properties of the relation. Reflexivity is pointed out by Goel et al. [12], and we are the first to point out transitivity.

Lemma 4.3. The binary relation “unsaturation” forms a quasi-order.

The unsaturation does not satisfy symmetry and antisymmetry; however, the following lemma shows that we immediately obtain $d_i = d_k$ if $i \lesssim k$ and $k \lesssim i$.

Lemma 4.4. If $i \lesssim k$, then it holds $d_i \leq d_k$.

Next, we obtain another characterization of unsaturation. From the first statement below, we can see that just after k 's demand decreases to 0 in lines 5 or 9 of Algorithm 1, $\delta_i = d_i$ for buyer i with $i \lesssim k$. This corresponds to Lemmata 4.13 and 4.15 in Goel et al. [12].

Lemma 4.5. It holds $i \lesssim k$ if and only if $f_{x,d-k}(N) - f_{x,d-k}(N \setminus i) = d_i^{-k}$. Moreover, for any $S \ni i$, if $i \lesssim k$, then $f_{x,d-k}(S) - f_{x,d-k}(S \setminus i) = d_i^{-k}$.

Moreover, the following lemma shows that once the buyers are dropped out from the auction, they are unsaturated by any buyers:

Lemma 4.6. Let i be a buyer with $d_i = 0$. Then, for any buyer $k \in N$, it holds $i \lesssim k$.

Finally, we show the relationship between unsaturation and clinching:

Proposition 4.7. Suppose that the demand of buyer i decreases from d_i to d'_i in lines 5 or 9 in a certain iteration of Algorithm 1. Then, for the transaction δ_k of buyer $k \neq i$ in that iteration, if $i \lesssim k$, then $\delta_k = d_i - d'_i$. Otherwise, $\delta_k < d_i - d'_i$.

4.2 Tight Sets Lemma

We use the dropping price, which was first introduced in the divisible case by Goel et al. [12], to characterize the dropping of buyers.

Definition 4.8 (Goel et al. [12]). Given an execution of Algorithm 1, we define the dropping price for buyer i by ϕ_i as the first price for which the buyer had zero demand.

It holds that $v_i \geq \phi_i$ for each $i \in N$. The goals of this section are as follows:

Theorem 4.9 (Tight sets lemma). Let i_1, i_2, \dots, i_t be the buyers dropping in lines 5 or 9, where they are sorted in the reverse order of their dropping. Then, it holds $\phi_{i_1} \geq \dots \geq \phi_{i_t}$. For each $k = 1, 2, \dots, t$, let X_k denote the set of buyers that have a positive demand just before the drop of i_k . Then we obtain:

(i) $\emptyset = X_0 \subset X_1 \subset X_2 \subset \dots \subset X_t = N$ is a chain of tight sets.

(ii) For $k = 1, 2, \dots, t$, it holds that $i_k \in X_k \setminus X_{k-1}$. It holds $\phi_{i_k} = v_{i_k}$ or $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \left[\frac{B_{i_k} - p_{i_k}^f}{\phi_{i_k} + \varepsilon} \right] = 0$

(iii) For buyer $i \in X_k \setminus (X_{k-1} \cup i_k)$, it holds that $\phi_i = \phi_{i_k}$ and $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \left[\frac{B_i - p_i^f}{\phi_i + \varepsilon} \right] = 0$. Moreover, if there exists a buyer $\hat{i} \in X_k \setminus X_{k-1}$ with $\frac{B_{\hat{i}} - p_{\hat{i}}^f}{\phi_{\hat{i}}} = 1$; then it holds $v_i > \phi_i$ for each $i \in X_k \setminus X_{k-1}$, and $\frac{B_{i_k} - p_{i_k}^f}{\phi_{i_k}} = 1$.

Although our model is the indivisible case of Goel et al. [13], Properties (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 4.9 are different. For example, in our tight sets lemma, for each $i \in X_k \setminus (X_{k-1} \cup i_k)$ for some k , it holds $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \left[\frac{B_i - p_i^f}{\phi_i + \varepsilon} \right] = 0$, whereas, in their tight sets lemma, it holds $p_i^f = B_i$. In our setting, a buyer who drops out of the auction does not necessarily exhaust her budget because the demand for less than one unit is rounded down. We use the dropping price to describe such buyers. The dropping price was used in Goel et al. [12] to deal with more general budget constraints than hard budget constraints³. However, in our indivisible setting, we need the dropping price even under hard budget constraints. Theorem 4.9 is one of the main technical contributions of this study.

We use the following propositions to prove Theorem 4.9. These were first considered for the divisible case with general budget constraints by Goel et al. [12]. We prove these propositions in a similar manner using the unsaturation in Section 4.1.

Proposition 4.10. If a buyer clinches the entire demand in a certain iteration, then there is a buyer who drops in the same iteration without clinching their entire demand.

We use the following lemma to prove Proposition 4.10, which corresponds to Lemmata 4.16 and 4.17 in Goel et al. [12].

Lemma 4.11. It holds $f_{x,d}(N) = f_{x,d}(N \setminus i)$ throughout the auction. Moreover, just after the execution of Algorithm 2, it holds $f_{x,d}(N) = f_{x,d}(N \setminus i) = f_{x,d-i}(N)$ for each $i \in N$.

Proof of Proposition 4.10. We prove that if a buyer's demand decreases to zero by clinching in a certain iteration, at least one of the following holds:

- The price is increased up to some active buyer's valuation.
- The right-hand limit of some active buyer's demand is zero.

Suppose that the demand of buyer i decreases by one in line 9 and still has non-zero demand d'_i . Then, $f_{x,d}(N \setminus i)$ is unchanged since it is independent of d_i . In addition, $f_{x,d}(N)$ is also unchanged by the monotonicity of $f_{x,d}$ and Lemma 4.11. Then, by Proposition 3.2 and Lemma 4.11, it holds $\delta_i = f_{x,d}(N) - f_{x,d}(N \setminus i) = 0$, and thus i does not drop in the iteration.

Moreover, the transaction δ_k of any other buyer $k \neq i$ is less than their demand d_k . If $i \lesssim k$, it follows from Lemma 4.4 that $d_i \leq d_k$. Thus, it follows from Proposition 4.7 that $\delta_k = d_i - d'_i \leq d_k - d'_i < d_k$. Otherwise, it follows from Proposition 4.7 that $\delta_k < d_i - d'_i = 1$, and thus, we have $\delta_k = 0$ since δ_k is an integer. Thus, no buyer drops out of the auction in the execution of Algorithm 2 just after i 's demand update.

This implies that if a buyer's demand decreases to zero by clinching in a certain iteration, then at least one of the above holds. \square

³Budget constraints $p_i \leq B_i$ ($i \in N$) are often called hard budget constraints

Proposition 4.12. After the execution of Algorithm 2 in any given iteration of Algorithm 1, for the set of buyers S with positive demands, it holds $x^f(S) = f(S)$.

Proof. At the beginning of the auction, it holds $x^f(N) = f(N)$ by Proposition 3.5. We prove that if the set of active buyers is tight in a certain iteration, then so is in the next iteration.

Suppose that $x^f(T) = f(T)$, where T represents the set of active buyers in a certain iteration. The claim holds trivially if the number of active buyers remains unchanged. Therefore, from Proposition 4.10, it suffices to consider the case in which there exists a buyer $i \in T$ whose demand becomes zero by the demand update in lines 5 or 9. Let x and d denote the allocation and demands, respectively, immediately before the demand update. For buyer k ($k \neq i$), if $\delta_k = d_k$ in the subsequent execution of Algorithm 2, $\delta_k = f_{x,d^{-i}}(N) - f_{x,d^{-i}}(N \setminus k)$ by Proposition 3.2. Then, we have $f_{x,d^{-i}}(N) - f_{x,d^{-i}}(N \setminus k) = d_k$, which means $k \lesssim i$ just after the demand update. Let S denote a set of i -saturated buyers. Then, by Proposition 4.7, it holds that $\delta_j < d_j$ for each $j \in S$; thus, buyers in S still have a positive demand after the execution of Algorithm 2. Then, it remains to show that $x^f(S) = f(S)$, which can be obtained by the followings:

$$(1) f_{x,d}(S) = f(S) - x(S)$$

By Theorem 3.1, we have $x(T) + f_{x,d}(T) = \min_{T' \subseteq T} \{f(T) + x(T \setminus T') + d(T \setminus T')\}$. This value is unchanged when buyers in T clinch certain amount of goods, and it is non-increasing by the update of the demand of buyers T in lines 5 and 9. On the other hand, it holds $x(T) + f_{x,d}(T) = f(T)$ at the beginning and at the end of the auction by the assumption, and thus $f_{x,d}(T) = f(T) - x(T)$ holds throughout the auction. Thus, when the demand d_i of buyer i decreases to 0, the value of $f_{x,d}(T)$ remains unchanged. Therefore, it holds $f_{x,d}(T) = f_{x,d^{-i}}(T) = f(T) - x(T)$. Then, by iteratively applying Lemma 4.5, $f_{x,d^{-i}}(T) = f_{x,d^{-i}}(S) + d(T \setminus (S \cup i)) = f_{x,d}(S) + d(T \setminus (S \cup i))$, where the last equality holds by $i \notin S$ and Observation 4.1. Therefore, just before the i 's demand update, we have $f_{x,d}(S) = f(T) - x(T) - d(T \setminus (S \cup i))$. After the demand update and the execution of Algorithm 2, since $x(S) + f_{x,d}(S)$ is unchanged and $d(T \setminus S)$ becomes 0, it holds $x^f(T \setminus S) = x(T \setminus S) + d(T \setminus (S \cup i))$. Combining these equalities, we have $f_{x,d}(S) + x(S) + x^f(T \setminus S) = (f(T) - x(T) - d(T \setminus (S \cup i))) + x(S) + (x(T \setminus S) + d(T \setminus (S \cup i))) = f(T)$. Since it holds $x^f(T) = f(T)$ by the assumption, we have $f_{x,d}(S) = x^f(S) - x(S)$.

$$(2) f_{x,d}(S) = x^f(S) - x(S)$$

Suppose $f_{x,d}(S) \neq f(S) - x(S)$. Then, there exists a subset $S' \subset S$ with $f_{x,d}(S) = f(S') - x(S') + d(S \setminus S')$. From Theorem 3.1, it holds for any $j \in S \setminus S'$ that $f_{x,d}(S \setminus j) + d_j \leq f(S') - x(S') + d(S \setminus (S' \cup j)) + d_j = f_{x,d}(S)$. In addition, from Theorem 3.1, it holds $f_{x,d}(S \setminus j) + d_j \geq f(S') - x(S') + d(S \setminus S') = f_{x,d}(S)$. Therefore, we have $f_{x,d}(S) - f_{x,d}(S \setminus j) = d_j$. Observation 4.1 indicates that $f_{x,d^{-i}}(S) - f_{x,d^{-i}}(S \setminus j) = f_{x,d}(S) - f_{x,d}(S \setminus j) = d_j$ by $i \notin S$. Then, by Lemma 4.6 and iteratively applying Lemma 4.5, it holds that $f_{x,d^{-i}}(N) = f_{x,d^{-i}}(S) + d(N \setminus S)$ and $f_{x,d^{-i}}(N \setminus j) = f_{x,d^{-i}}(S \setminus j) + d(N \setminus S)$. Using this, we have $f_{x,d^{-i}}(N) - f_{x,d^{-i}}(N \setminus j) = f_{x,d^{-i}}(S) - f_{x,d^{-i}}(S \setminus j) = d_j$, which means $j \lesssim i$, contradicting j is i -saturated. Therefore, we have $f_{x,d}(S) = f(S) - x(S)$. \square

Now, we are ready for the proof of Theorem 4.9.

Proof of Theorem 4.9. Property (i) holds from Proposition 4.12. For Property (ii), let i_k ($k \in N$) be a buyer whose demand decreases to zero in lines 5 or 9 of Algorithm 1. Buyer i_k drops by either of the following:

- The price increases to their valuation (line 5).
- The right-hand limit of their demand at the current price is zero (line 9).

These two cases correspond to the first and the second cases in Property (ii), respectively.

For Property (iii), suppose that $i \in X_k \setminus X_{k-1} \cup i_k$. Then, $\phi_i = \phi_{i_k}$ holds by Proposition 4.10 because we use common price clock for all buyers, and thus, these two buyers drop out at the same price. Further, buyer i must have experienced a demand update at least once in lines 5 or 9 before the dropping. If not, their demand is $f(i) + 1 - x_i^f \geq 1$, which means that their demand never becomes zero by the polymatroid constraint $x_i^f \leq f(i)$. After i 's demand is updated, their demand changes keeping the inequality $d_i \geq \frac{B_i - p_i}{c} - 1$ by Lemma 3.4. When the demand decreases to zero, it holds $\frac{B_i - p_i^f}{\phi_i} \leq 1$, thus, we have $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \left[\frac{B_i - p_i^f}{\phi_i + \varepsilon} \right] = 0$. If there exists a buyer $\hat{i} \in X_k \setminus X_{k-1}$ with $\frac{B_{\hat{i}} - p_{\hat{i}}^f}{\phi_{\hat{i}}} = 1$, then $\hat{i} = i_k$ or \hat{i} 's demand was updated in line 9 in the same iteration before the update of i_k 's demand when $c = \phi_{i_k}$. After the update, \hat{i} 's demand is changed keeping the equality $d_{\hat{i}} = \frac{B_{\hat{i}} - p_{\hat{i}}}{\phi_{\hat{i}}} - 1$. Thus, i_k is dropped by the demand update in line 9, and it holds $v_i > \phi_i$ for $i \in X_k \setminus X_{k-1}$. Therefore, we have $\frac{B_{i_k} - p_{i_k}^f}{\phi_{i_k}} = 1$. \square

We now prove that Theorem 4.9 is stronger than the ‘‘no trading path property’’ reported by Fiat et al. [9] and Colini-Baldeschi et al. [4] for their clinching auctions. First, we introduce a trading pair, which is a generalization of the trading path in [4, 9]. We define the saturation and dependence functions to characterize the trading pair. A saturation function $\text{sat} : P \rightarrow 2^N$ is defined by $\text{sat}(x) := \{i \mid i \in N, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{++} : x + \alpha \chi_i \notin P\}$, where χ_A represents an indicator vector for $A \subseteq N$. Moreover, for $x \in P$ and $i \in \text{sat}(x)$, a dependence function $\text{dep} : P \times N \rightarrow 2^N$ is defined by $\text{dep}(x, i) := \{i' \mid i' \in N, \exists \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{++} : x + \alpha(\chi_i - \chi_{i'}) \in P\}$.

Definition 4.13. A pair of buyers (i, j) is a trading pair with respect to the allocation (x, p) if the followings hold: (i) $j \in \text{dep}(x, i)$, (ii) v_j is strictly greater than v_i , and (iii) the remaining budget $B_j - p_j$ is not less than v_i .

Corollary 4.14. There is no trading pair with respect to (x^f, p^f) .

Proof. Suppose that there exists a trading pair (i, j) , and $j \in X_k \setminus X_{k-1}$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$. By Property (i) of Theorem 4.9, it holds that $x^f(X_k) = f(X_k)$. Thus, we obtain $i \in X_k$ by $j \in \text{dep}(x, i)$ and $j \in X_k \setminus X_{k-1}$. Thus, we have $v_i \geq \phi_i \geq \phi_j$ by Theorem 4.9. If $v_j = \phi_j$, then it holds $v_i \geq \phi_i \geq \phi_j = v_j$, contradicting the condition (ii) of trading pair. It suffices to consider the case where $v_j > \phi_j$. By Property (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 4.9, it holds $(B_j - p_j^f)/\phi_j \leq 1$. Thus, if $v_i > \phi_i$, it holds that $B_j - p_j^f \leq \phi_j \leq \phi_i < v_i$, which contradicts the condition (iii) of trading pair. It remains the case where $v_j > \phi_j$ and $v_i = \phi_i$. If $\phi_i > \phi_j$, by Property (iii) of Theorem 4.9, it holds that $(B_j - p_j^f)/\phi_j \leq 1$, and thus we have $B_j - p_j^f \leq \phi_j < \phi_i = v_i$, which contradicts the condition (iii) of trading pair. If $\phi_i = \phi_j$, then j drops out in line 6 of Algorithm 1 because j drops out of the auction before or in the same iteration as i by $i \in X_k$ and $j \in X_k \setminus X_{k-1}$. This implies that $(B_j - p_j^f)/\phi_j < 1$. Again, we have $B_j - p_j^f < \phi_j = \phi_i = v_i$, which contradicts the condition (iii) of trading pair. \square

Corollary 4.14 states that we even obtain a stronger evidence for the efficiency of clinching auctions for indivisible goods because our model and mechanism are generalizations of Colini-Baldeschi et al. [4] and Fiat et al. [9].

5 Efficiency

5.1 Pareto Optimality

We first show that our mechanism satisfies PO using Theorem 4.9, as in Goel et al. [12, 13].

Theorem 5.1. Our mechanism satisfies PO.

In the proof of Theorem 5.1, we use mathematical induction, as in the proof of Theorem 4.6 in Goel et al. [12]. On the other hand, we use the following non-increasing sequence $\{\theta_k\}_{k \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}}$ instead of the dropping prices $\{\phi_k\}_{k \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}}$:

Lemma 5.2. There exists a non-increasing sequence $\{\theta_k\}_{k \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}}$ that satisfies $\phi_{i_k} = \theta_k = v_{i_k}$ if $\phi_{i_k} = v_{i_k}$, and $\phi_{i_k} < \theta_k < v_{i_k}$, otherwise, for each $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$.

We also define ϕ_{i_0} and θ_0 by $\phi_{i_0} = \theta_0 = \phi_{i_1}$. Now we are ready for the proof of Theorem 5.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Suppose that there exists an other allocation $\mathcal{A} := (x', p')$ satisfying (i) $v_i x_i^f - p_i^f \leq v_i x'_i - p'_i$ for each $i \in N$, (ii) $p^f(N) \leq p'(N)$, and (iii) at least one inequality holds without equality. Combining these inequalities, we have $\sum_{i \in N} v_i x_i^f < \sum_{i \in N} v_i x'_i$.

Subsequently, we prove that $p^f(X_k) - p'(X_k) \geq \theta_k(x^f(X_k) - x'(X_k)) \geq 0$ for each $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, t\}$, where $\{\theta_k\}_{k \in \{0, 1, \dots, t\}}$ is a non-increasing sequence in Lemma 5.2, and $\{X_k\}_{k \in \{0, 1, \dots, t\}}$ is the chain of tight sets in Theorem 4.9. Note that for $k = 0$, the inequality trivially holds by $X_0 = \emptyset$. Suppose that the inequality holds for $k - 1$. We prove it holds for k . Since $x'(X_{k-1}) \leq f(X_{k-1}) = x^f(X_{k-1})$ and $x'(X_k) \leq f(X_k) = x^f(X_k)$ by property (i) of Theorem 4.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \theta_k(x^f(X_k) - x'(X_k)) \\ &\leq \theta_{k-1}(x^f(X_{k-1}) - x'(X_{k-1})) + \theta_k(x^f(X_k \setminus X_{k-1}) - x'(X_k \setminus X_{k-1})) \\ &\leq p^f(X_{k-1}) - p'(X_{k-1}) + \theta_k(x^f(X_k \setminus X_{k-1}) - x'(X_k \setminus X_{k-1})) \\ &\leq p^f(X_{k-1}) - p'(X_{k-1}) + p^f(X_k \setminus X_{k-1}) - p'(X_k \setminus X_{k-1}) = p^f(X_k) - p'(X_k), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows by $\theta_{k-1} \geq \theta_k$ for any $k \in \{1, \dots, t\}$.

Then, we have the following, whose proof is provided in Appendix C.

Claim 5.3. It holds $p_i^f - p'_i \geq \theta_k(x_i^f - x'_i)$ for each $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ and $i \in X_k \setminus X_{k-1}$. Moreover, if all the inequalities hold in equality, it holds $\phi_{i_k} = \theta_k = v_{i_k}$ for each $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ and $x_i^f \geq x'_i$ and $i \in N \setminus \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_t\}$.

Thus we have $p^f(X_k) - p'(X_k) \geq \theta_k(x^f(X_k) - x'(X_k)) \geq 0$ for each $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, t\}$. By Substituting k with t , we have $p^f(N) - p'(N) \geq \theta_t(x^f(N) - x'(N)) \geq 0$. Since we assume $p^f(N) \leq p'(N)$, this implies that all of the inequalities hold in equality. Therefore, by Lemma 5.3, we have $\theta_k = \phi_{i_k} = v_{i_k}$ for each $k \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $x_i^f \geq x'_i$ for each $i \in N \setminus \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_t\}$. Using this, we prove $\sum_{i \in X_k} v_i x_i^f \geq \sum_{i \in X_k} v_i x'_i$ for each $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, t\}$. Note that for $k = 0$, the inequality trivially holds by $X_0 = \emptyset$. Suppose that $\sum_{i \in X_{k-1}} v_i(x_i^f - x'_i) \geq v_{i_{k-1}}(x^f(X_{k-1}) - x'(X_{k-1}))$ holds for $k - 1$. We prove it holds for k . Then, by $v_i \geq \phi_{i_k} = v_{i_k}$ and $x_i^f \geq x'_i$ for each $i \in X_k \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$, and $x^f(X_k) = f(X_k) \geq x'(X_k)$ by Property (i) of Theorem 4.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in X_k} v_i(x_i^f - x'_i) &\geq v_{i_{k-1}}(x^f(X_{k-1}) - x'(X_{k-1})) + \sum_{i \in X_k \setminus X_{k-1}} v_{i_k}(x_i^f - x'_i) \\ &\geq v_{i_k}(x^f(X_{k-1}) - x'(X_{k-1})) + v_{i_k}(x^f(X_k \setminus X_{k-1}) - x'(X_k \setminus X_{k-1})) \\ &= v_{i_k}(x^f(X_k) - x'(X_k)) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus it holds $\sum_{i \in X_k} v_i(x_i^f - x'_i) \geq v_{i_k}(x^f(X_k) - x'(X_k)) \geq 0$ for any $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, t\}$. Substitute k with t , we have $\sum_{i \in N} v_i x_i^f \geq \sum_{i \in N} v_i x'_i$, which contradicts the hypothesis. \square

5.2 Liquid Welfare

We provide the LW guarantee of our mechanism. Let LW^{M} and LW^{OPT} denote the LW of our mechanism and the optimal LW, respectively. Our goal is as follows:

Theorem 5.4. It holds $\text{LW}^{\text{M}} \geq \frac{1}{2}\text{LW}^{\text{OPT}}$.

Note that this guarantee is tight by the following example:

Example 5.5. Consider a multi-unit auction with two buyers and one seller. The seller owns k ($k \gg 1$) unit of goods, and the market is represented by a perfect bipartite graph without polymatroid constraint. Buyer 1 has valuation 1 and infinite budget, and buyer 2 has valuation k and budget k . Then, LW is maximized when buyer 1 obtains $k - 1$ unit of goods and buyer 2 obtains one unit of good. Thus, the optimal LW is $2k - 1$ by $k \gg 1$. In our mechanism, the price goes up to 1 in line 3 of the first iteration, and then the demand of buyer 1 decreases to zero. Then, all the goods are allocated to buyer 2, and the LW of our mechanism is $\min(k^2, k) = k$ by $k \gg 1$. Thus, $\text{LW}^{\text{M}} = k \leq \frac{k}{2k-1}\text{LW}^{\text{OPT}}$. Taking $k \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\frac{k}{2k-1} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$, and thus the guarantee in Theorem 5.4 is tight.

Although the basic idea of the proof is inherited from that of Sato [21], our proof requires a clever handling of indivisible goods, and thus is another technical contribution of this study.

First, we consider an optimal allocation in terms of LW. For each buyer $i \in N$, consider two copies i_a, i_b , where i_a represents a buyer whose valuation is v_i and their budget is $\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \rfloor v_i$, and i_b represents a buyer whose valuation and budget are $B_i - \lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \rfloor v_i$ ⁴. Let $N' := \cup_{i \in N} \{i_a, i_b\}$. We define a map $\Gamma : 2^{N'} \rightarrow 2^N$ that outputs the union of buyers i with $\{i_a, i_b\} \cap S' \neq \emptyset$ for each $S' \subseteq N'$. In addition, we define a new monotone submodular function $f' : 2^{N'} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ by $f'(S') := f(\Gamma(S'))$ ($S' \subseteq N'$). Note that f' is again a monotone submodular function; see, e.g., Section 44.6g of Schrijver [22]. Then, an allocation for the original market can be constructed simply by summing the allocated goods of the corresponding two buyers from an allocation for N' .

An optimal allocation can be obtained by the greedy procedure described below. Suppose that buyers in N' are ordered in descending order according to their valuations. For each buyer $i' \in N'$, let $H_{i'} := \{1, 2, \dots, i' - 1\}$ denote the set of buyer $k \in N'$ who has a higher valuation than i' , or who has the same valuation as i' and $\Gamma(k)$ is numbered before $\Gamma(i')$ in N . Then, the following holds:

Proposition 5.6. The optimal allocation $\tilde{x}^* := (\tilde{x}_i^*)_{i \in N}$ is given by $\tilde{x}_i^* = x_{i_a}^* + x_{i_b}^*$ for each $i \in N$, where $x_{i'}^* = \min(\frac{B_{i'}}{v_{i'}}, \min_{H \subseteq H_{i'}} \{f'(H \cup i') - x_{i'}^*(H)\})$ for each $i' \in N'$.

The proof of Proposition 5.6 is given in Appendix C. Using this optimal allocations, we have

$$\text{LW}^{\text{OPT}} = \sum_{i \in N} \min(v_i \tilde{x}_i^*, B_i) = \sum_{i \in N} (v_{i_a} x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^*),$$

where the second equality holds by the definition of v_{i_b} . Proposition 5.6 indicates that for each $i \in N$, the buyer i_a (resp. i_b) for some $i \in N$ can obtain at most $\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \rfloor$ (resp. 1) unit of goods in this optimal allocation. Then, the following proposition illustrates the relationship between the allocation of goods in our mechanism and the optimal allocation obtained by Proposition 5.6.

Proposition 5.7. If $x_i^f < \tilde{x}_i^*$ and $v_i > \phi_i$ for some $i \in N$, then it holds $x_i^f = x_{i_a}^* = \lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \rfloor$, $x_{i_b}^* = 1$, and $v_{i_b} \leq \phi_i$.

⁴If $B_i = \infty$, we define $v_{i_b} = B_{i_b} = 0$.

To prove this, we use the following lemma.

Lemma 5.8. It holds $x_{i_b}^* = \frac{B_{i_b}}{v_{i_b}} = 1$ only if $x_{i_a}^* = \frac{B_{i_a}}{v_{i_a}} = \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor$ for each $i \in N$.

Proof. Suppose that $x_{i_a}^* < \frac{B_{i_a}}{v_{i_a}} = \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor$. Then, there exists a set $H^* \subseteq H_{i_a}$ such that $x^*(H^* \cup i_a) = f'(H^* \cup i_a)$. By $v_{i_a} > v_{i_b}$, it holds $H_{i_b} \supseteq H_{i_a} \cup i_a$. Then, it holds $f'(H^* \cup i_a \cup i_b) = f(\Gamma(H^*) \cup i) = f'(H^* \cup i_a)$. Thus, we have $x_{i_b}^* \leq \min_{H \subseteq H_{i_b}} \{f'(H \cup i_b) - x^*(H)\} \leq f'(H^* \cup i_a \cup i_b) - x^*(H \cup i_a) = f'(H^* \cup i_a) - x^*(H \cup i_a) = 0$. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.7. By Property (iii) of Theorem 4.9 and $v_i > \phi_i$, it holds $\left\lfloor \frac{B_i - p_i^f}{v_i} \right\rfloor \leq \frac{B_i - p_i^f}{v_i} < \frac{B_i - p_i^f}{\phi_i} \leq 1$, which means $\left\lfloor \frac{B_i - p_i^f}{v_i} \right\rfloor = 0$ for i with $v_i > \phi_i$. Then, combining this with Lemma 3.4 and Proposition 5.6, we have $x_i^f \geq \left\lfloor \frac{p_i^f}{v_i} \right\rfloor \geq \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor \geq x_{i_a}^*$. Thus, if $x_i^f < x_{i_a}^*$, this implies $x_i^f = x_{i_a}^* = \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor$ and $x_{i_b}^* = 1$ by Lemma 5.8.

Suppose that $v_{i_b} > \phi_i$. Since each buyer must clinch the goods at the price less than their dropping price, we have $p_i^f \leq \phi_i x_i^f = \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor \phi_i$. Using this and the definition of v_{i_b} , we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \left\lfloor \frac{B_i - p_i^f}{\phi_i + \varepsilon} \right\rfloor \geq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \left\lfloor \frac{\left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor v_i + v_{i_b} - \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor \phi_i}{\phi_i + \varepsilon} \right\rfloor \geq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \left\lfloor \frac{v_{i_b}}{\phi_i + \varepsilon} \right\rfloor = 1,$$

contradicting Property (ii) or (iii) of Theorem 4.9. Thus, we have $v_{i_b} \leq \phi_i$. \square

Using this, we have the following lemma used in the proof of Theorems 5.4 and 5.12.

Lemma 5.9. For each $i \in N$, it holds $v_i x_i^f - (v_{i_a} x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^*) \geq \phi_i (x_i^f - \tilde{x}_i^*)$. Moreover, for each $i \in N$ with $x_i^f < \tilde{x}_i^*$, it holds $(\phi_i x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^* - \phi_i x_i^f) \geq \min(v_i \tilde{x}_i^*, B_i) - \min(v_i x_i^f, B_i)$.

The proof of Lemma 5.9 is provided in Appendix C.

Now, we obtain a lower bound of payments in our mechanism for the set of buyer i with $x_i^f \geq \tilde{x}_i^*$. This theorem plays a critical role in the proof of Theorem 5.4, and is another technical contribution of this study.

Theorem 5.10. It holds $\sum_{i \in N; x_i^f \geq \tilde{x}_i^*} p_i^f \geq \sum_{i \in N; x_i^f < \tilde{x}_i^*} (\phi_i x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^* - \phi_i x_i^f)$.

The proof of Theorem 5.10 is provided at the end of this subsection, and we are now ready for the proof of Theorem 5.4.

Proof of Theorem 5.4. For buyer i with $x_i^f < \tilde{x}_i^*$, by Lemma 5.9, it holds $(\phi_i x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^* - \phi_i x_i^f) \geq \min(v_i \tilde{x}_i^*, B_i) - \min(v_i x_i^f, B_i)$. Combining this with Theorem 5.10, we have

$$\sum_{i \in N; x_i^f \geq \tilde{x}_i^*} p_i^f \geq \sum_{i \in N; x_i^f < \tilde{x}_i^*} (\phi_i x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^* - \phi_i x_i^f) \geq \sum_{i \in N; x_i^f < \tilde{x}_i^*} (\min(v_i \tilde{x}_i^*, B_i) - \min(v_i x_i^f, B_i)).$$

By $v_i x_i^f \geq p_i^f$ and $B_i \geq p_i^f$, it holds $\min(v_i x_i^f, B_i) \geq p_i^f$ for each $i \in N$. Thus, we have

$$\text{LW}^M = \sum_{i \in N} \min(v_i x_i^f, B_i) \geq \sum_{i \in N; x_i^f < \tilde{x}_i^*} \min(v_i x_i^f, B_i) + \sum_{i \in N; x_i^f \geq \tilde{x}_i^*} p_i^f \geq \sum_{i \in N; x_i^f < \tilde{x}_i^*} \min(v_i \tilde{x}_i^*, B_i).$$

By $LW^M \geq \sum_{i \in N; x_i^f \geq \tilde{x}_i^*} \min(v_i x_i^f, B_i) \geq \sum_{i \in N; x_i^f \geq \tilde{x}_i^*} \min(v_i \tilde{x}_i^*, B_i)$, we have

$$2LW^M \geq \sum_{i \in N; x_i^f < \tilde{x}_i^*} \min(v_i \tilde{x}_i^*, B_i) + \sum_{i \in N; x_i^f \geq \tilde{x}_i^*} \min(v_i \tilde{x}_i^*, B_i) = \sum_{i \in N} \min(v_i \tilde{x}_i^*, B_i) = LW^{\text{OPT}}.$$

□

Our remaining work aims to prove Theorem 5.10, which corresponds to Theorem 3.9 in Sato [21]. However, since we consider indivisible goods, we modified it based on the difference in the tight sets lemma in both studies. Consider a certain iteration of Algorithm 1, where x and d represent the current allocation of goods and demands, respectively, and c represents current price. Define $X := \{i \in N \mid d_i > 0\}$, $Y := \{i \in X \mid x_i^f < \tilde{x}_i^*\}$ as in Sato [21]. In addition, we define $Y_c := \{i \in Y \mid c < v_{i_b}\}$, and $x_a^*(S) := \sum_{i \in S} x_{i_a}^*$ and $x_b^*(S) := \sum_{i \in S} x_{i_b}^*$ for any $S \subseteq N$. Then, the following invariant inequality holds:

Proposition 5.11. It holds $f_{x,d}(Y) - x_a^*(Y) + x(Y) - x_b^*(Y_c) \geq 0$.

Proof. Let $Y' \subseteq Y$ be a minimizer of $f_{x,d}(Y)$, i.e. $f_{x,d}(Y) = f(Y') - x(Y') + d(Y \setminus Y')$ by Theorem 3.1. Then, $f_{x,d}(Y) - x_a^*(Y) + x(Y) - x_b^*(Y_c) = f(Y') - x(Y') + d(Y \setminus Y') - x_a^*(Y) + x(Y) - x_b^*(Y_c) = f(Y') - x_a^*(Y') - x_b^*(Y' \cap Y_c) + x(Y \setminus Y') + d(Y \setminus Y') - x_a^*(Y \setminus Y') - x_b^*(Y_c \setminus Y')$. By polymatroid constraints, it holds $f(Y') - x_a^*(Y') - x_b^*(Y' \cap Y_c) \geq f(Y') - \tilde{x}^*(Y') \geq 0$. Thus, we have $f_{x,d}(Y) - x_a^*(Y) + x(Y) - x_b^*(Y) \geq x(Y \setminus Y') + d(Y \setminus Y') - x_a^*(Y \setminus Y') - x_b^*(Y_c \setminus Y') \geq \sum_{i \in Y \setminus Y'} (x_i + d_i - x_{i_a}^* - \Delta_i)$, where $\Delta_i = 1$ if $c < v_{i_b}$ and $\Delta_i = 0$ otherwise. Then, we prove $x_i + d_i - x_{i_a}^* - \Delta_i \geq 0$ for each $i \in Y \setminus Y'$.

If $c < v_{i_b} < v_i$, it holds $\Delta_i = 1$. By the definition of v_{i_b} , it holds $B_i = \lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \rfloor v_i + v_{i_b}$. In addition, by Proposition 5.6, it holds $x_{i_a}^* \leq \lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \rfloor$. Using these and Lemma 3.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_i + d_i - x_{i_a}^* - \Delta_i &\geq \left\lfloor \frac{p_i}{v_{i_b}} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \rfloor v_i + v_{i_b} - p_i}{v_{i_b}} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor - 1 \\ &\geq \left\lfloor \frac{p_i}{v_{i_b}} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \rfloor v_{i_b} + v_{i_b} - p_i}{v_{i_b}} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor - 1 \\ &= \left\lfloor \frac{p_i}{v_{i_b}} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor + 1 - \left\lfloor \frac{p_i}{v_{i_b}} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor - 1 = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds by $x_i \geq \lfloor \frac{p_i}{c} \rfloor \geq \lfloor \frac{p_i}{v_{i_b}} \rfloor$.

If $v_{i_b} \leq c$, it holds $\Delta_i = 0$. Then, by Lemma 3.4, we have

$$x_i + d_i - x_{i_a}^* - \Delta_i \geq \left\lfloor \frac{p_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{B_i - p_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor \geq \left\lfloor \frac{p_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{p_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor = 0.$$

□

Proposition 5.11 corresponds to Theorem 3.6 in Sato [21]. The difference is that the optimal allocation is divided into x_a^* and x_b^* , and Y_c is used for x_b^* instead of Y . These are the points that are handled well for integer constraints. Now we are ready for the proof of Theorem 5.10. We use “backward” mathematical induction as in Sato [21].

Proof of Theorem 5.10. We prove that it holds

$$\sum_{i \in X \setminus Y} (p_i^f - p_i) \geq \sum_{i \in Y} \phi_i(x_{i_a}^* - x_i^f) + \sum_{i \in Y_c} v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^* + c(f_{x,d}(X) - x_a^*(Y) - x_b^*(Y_c) + x(Y)) \quad (3)$$

throughout the execution of Algorithm 1. At the end of Algorithm 1, the inequality holds because both sides are equal to 0 by $X = Y = Y_c = \emptyset$. Suppose that the inequality holds at the end of an iteration. We then prove that it holds at the beginning using the following case-by-case analysis. Note that in the following, we use $f_{x,d}(X) + x(Y) = f(X) - x(X) + x(Y) = f(X) - x(X) + x(Y) + (f(N) - f(X) - x^f(N \setminus X)) = f(N) - x(N \setminus Y)$, where the first and the second equalities follow from Property (i) of Theorem 4.9, and the third equality follows from the fact that buyers in $N \setminus X$ have already dropped.

(1) Execution of Algorithm 2:

For buyer i who belongs to $X \setminus Y$ just before clinching $\delta_i > 0$ amount of goods, the left-hand side of inequality (3) is decreased by $c\delta_i$. The first and the second terms on the right-hand side are unchanged because $i \notin Y$, and the third term on the right side is decreased by $c\delta_i$ by $f_{x,d}(X) + x(Y) = f(N) - x(N \setminus Y)$. Thus, both sides of inequality (3) is decreased by $c\delta_i$. For buyer $i \in Y$ whose demand remains positive after clinching, the left-hand side and the first and the second terms on the right-hand side are unchanged. Moreover, the third term on the right side is also unchanged by $f_{x,d}(X) + x(Y) = f(N) - x(N \setminus Y)$. Thus, both sides of inequality (3) are unchanged. For buyer $i \in Y$ whose demand is positive before the execution of Algorithm 2 and becomes zero by clinching, it holds from $d_i > 0$ that $c \leq v_i$. If $c = v_i$, then $v_{i_b} \leq v_i = c = \phi_i$, and thus $i \notin Y_c$. Otherwise, from Proposition 5.7, we have $v_{i_b} \leq \phi_i = c$, which means $i \notin Y_c$. Therefore, the left side and the second term on the right-hand side is unchanged by $i \in Y \setminus Y_c$. The first term on the right-hand side is decreased by $\phi_i(x_{i_a}^* - x_i^f) = c(x_{i_a}^* - x_i^f)$. In addition, the third term on the right-hand side is increased by $c(x_{i_a}^* - x_i^f)$ because $f_{x,d}(X) + x(Y) = f(N) - x(N \setminus Y)$. Then, both sides of inequality (3) change by the same amount.

Therefore, if (3) holds after the execution of Algorithm 2, it holds before that.

(2) The demand update:

Suppose that the demand of buyer i is updated in lines 5 and 9. If the demand d_i is still positive after the update, both sides of inequality (3) are obviously unchanged because $f_{x,d}(X) + x(Y) = f(N) - x(N \setminus Y)$ is unchanged. In the following, we consider the case where the demand d_i becomes zero. The left-hand side of (3) is unchanged by $p_i = p_i^f$ before the update. Suppose that $i \in X \setminus Y$. Then, both sides are obviously unchanged. Suppose that $i \in Y_c$ before the update. Then, it holds $c = \phi_i < v_{i_b} < v_i$, which contradicts with Proposition 5.7. Suppose that $i \in Y \setminus Y_c$ before the update. The first term is reduced by $\phi_i(x_{i_a}^* - x_i^f) = c(x_{i_a}^* - x_i^f)$, the second term remains unchanged, and the third term is increased by $c(x_{i_a}^* - x_i^f)$. Thus, the right-hand side remains unchanged. Therefore, if (3) holds after the price update, it holds before the price update.

(3) The price update:

It suffices to consider the change of Y_c in the second and third terms on the right-hand side of (3) because x and d are unchanged by the price update. Let \tilde{c} be the price before the update. By Proposition 5.11, it holds that $f_{x,d}(Y) - x_a^*(Y) + x(Y) \geq x_b^*(Y_{\tilde{c}}) \geq x_b^*(Y_c^*)$ since $Y_{\tilde{c}} \supseteq Y_c$. Thus, we have $\sum_{i \in Y_c} v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^* + c(f_{x,d}(X) - x_a^*(Y) - x_b^*(Y_c) + x(Y)) \geq \sum_{i \in Y_c} v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^* + c(f_{x,d}(X) - x_a^*(Y) - x_b^*(Y_{\tilde{c}}) + x(Y)) + c x_b^*(Y_{\tilde{c}} \setminus Y_c) \geq \sum_{i \in Y_{\tilde{c}}^*} v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^* + \tilde{c}(f_{x,d}(X) - x_a^*(Y) - x_b^*(Y_{\tilde{c}}) + x(Y))$, where the last inequality holds for $\tilde{c} < v_{i_b} \leq c$ for each $i \in Y_{\tilde{c}} \setminus Y_c$. Thus, the left-hand side of inequality (3) is unchanged, and the right-hand side is increased by the price update. Therefore, if (3) holds after the price update, it holds before the price update.

We conclude that inequality (3) holds throughout the Algorithm 2. Thus, at the beginning of the auction, we have $\sum_{i \in N; x_i^f \geq \tilde{x}_i} p_i^f \geq \sum_{i \in N; x_i^f < \tilde{x}_i} (\phi_i x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^* - \phi_i x_i^f)$. \square

5.3 Social Welfare

We provide an efficiency guarantee for SW in our mechanism. Let SW^{M} denote the SW of our mechanism. Then, we obtain the lower bound for SW as follows.

Theorem 5.12. In Algorithm 1, It holds $\text{SW}^{\text{M}} = \sum_{i \in N} v_i x_i^{\text{f}} \geq \text{LW}^{\text{OPT}}$

This inequality is tight because the optimal LW is equal to the optimal SW if the budgets of all buyers are sufficiently large. In this case, Theorem 5.12 implies that our mechanism outputs an allocation that maximizes the SW.

Proof of Theorem 5.12. Using Theorem 4.9, we prove $\sum_{i \in X_k} v_i x_i^{\text{f}} \geq \sum_{i \in X_k} (v_{i_a} x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^*) + \phi_{i_k}(x^{\text{f}}(X_k) - \tilde{x}^*(X_k))$ for each $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, t\}$ by mathematical induction. For $k = 0$, both sides are equal to 0 by $X_0 = \emptyset$. Suppose that the inequality holds for $k - 1$. By Property (i) of Theorem 4.9, it holds $x^{\text{f}}(X_{k-1}) \geq \tilde{x}^*(X_{k-1})$. Then, by Lemma 5.9, we have $v_i x_i^{\text{f}} - (v_{i_a} x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^*) \geq \phi_i(x_i^{\text{f}} - \tilde{x}_i^*)$ for $i \in X_k \setminus X_{k-1}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in X_k} (v_i x_i^{\text{f}} - (v_{i_a} x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^*)) &\geq \phi_{i_{k-1}}(x^{\text{f}}(X_{k-1}) - \tilde{x}^*(X_{k-1})) + \sum_{i \in X_k \setminus X_{k-1}} \phi_i(x_i^{\text{f}} - \tilde{x}_i^*) \\ &\geq \phi_{i_k}(x^{\text{f}}(X_{k-1}) - \tilde{x}^*(X_{k-1})) + \sum_{i \in X_k \setminus X_{k-1}} \phi_{i_k}(x_i^{\text{f}} - \tilde{x}_i^*) \\ &= \phi_{i_k}(x^{\text{f}}(X_k) - \tilde{x}^*(X_k)), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds by $\phi_i \geq \phi_{i_k}$ for $i \in X_k$ and $x^{\text{f}}(X_{k-1}) \geq \tilde{x}^*(X_{k-1})$ by Property (i) of Theorem 4.9. Substituting k with t , it holds $\sum_{i \in X_t} x_i^{\text{f}} = f(N) \geq \sum_{i \in X_t} \tilde{x}_i^*$ by Proposition 3.5 and $X_t = N$. Thus, we have $\text{SW}^{\text{M}} = \sum_{i \in N} v_i x_i^{\text{f}} \geq \sum_{i \in N} (v_{i_a} x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^*) = \text{LW}^{\text{OPT}}$. \square

Finally, we describe the implications of Theorem 5.12, which seems the comparison between different measures. In budget-constrained auctions, modifying the valuations to make the market non-budgeted is often considered; see, e.g., Lehmann et al. [18]. If each buyer's valuation is modified to the budget-additive valuation, then LW is interpreted as the SW. In this approach, the optimal LW is used as the target value of SW and can be thought as a reasonable benchmark of SW. Thus, the above comparison makes sense, and Theorem 5.12 clearly provides another evidence for high efficiency of our mechanism.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Research Fellow Grant Number JP22J22831, Japan and Grant-in-Aid for Challenging Research (Exploratory) Grant Number JP21K19759, Japan.

References

- [1] Lawrence M. Ausubel. An efficient ascending-bid auction for multiple objects. *American Economic Review*, 94(5):1452–1475, 2004.
- [2] Sayan Bhattacharya, Vincent Conitzer, Kamesh Munagala, and Lirong Xia. Incentive compatible budget elicitation in multi-unit auctions. In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '10*, pages 554–572, Austin, 2010.

- [3] Sushil Bikhchandani, Sven de Vries, James Schummer, and Rakesh V. Vohra. An ascending vickrey auction for selling bases of a matroid. *Operations Research*, 59(2):400–413, 2011.
- [4] Riccardo Colini-Baldeschi, Stefano Leonardi, Monika Henzinger, and Martin Starnberger. On multiple keyword sponsored search auctions with budgets. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation*, 4(1):2:1–2:34, 2015.
- [5] Shahar Dobzinski, Ron Lavi, and Noam Nisan. Multi-unit auctions with budget limits. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 74(2):486–503, 2012.
- [6] Shahar Dobzinski and Renato Paes Leme. Efficiency guarantees in auctions with budgets. In *Proceedings of the 41 st International Colloquium Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP '14*, pages 392–404, Copenhagen, 2014.
- [7] Paul Dütting, Monika Henzinger, and Martin Starnberger. Auctions for heterogeneous items and budget limits. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation*, 4(1):4:1–4:17, 2015.
- [8] Benjamin Edelman, Michael Ostrovsky, and Michael Schwarz. Internet advertising and the generalized second-price auction: Selling billions of dollars worth of keywords. *American Economic Review*, 97(1):242–259, 2007.
- [9] Amos Fiat, Stefano Leonardi, Jared Saia, and Piotr Sankowski. Single valued combinatorial auctions with budgets. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce, EC '11*, pages 223–232, San Jose, 2011.
- [10] Satoru Fujishige. *Submodular Functions and Optimization, Second Edition*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2005.
- [11] Gagan Goel, Stefano Leonardi, Vahab Mirrokni, Afshin Nikzad, and Renato Paes Leme. Reservation Exchange Markets for Internet Advertising. In *Proceedings of the 43 rd International Colloquium Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP '16*, pages 142:1–142:13, Rome, 2016.
- [12] Gagan Goel, Vahab Mirrokni, and Renato Paes Leme. Clinching auctions beyond hard budget constraints. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation, EC '14*, pages 167–184, Palo Alto, 2014.
- [13] Gagan Goel, Vahab Mirrokni, and Renato Paes Leme. Polyhedral clinching auctions and the adwords polytope. *Journal of the ACM*, 62(3):18:1–18:27, 2015.
- [14] Gagan Goel, Vahab Mirrokni, and Renato Paes Leme. Clinching auctions with online supply. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 123:342–358, 2020.
- [15] Hiroshi Hirai and Ryosuke Sato. Polyhedral clinching auctions for two-sided markets. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 47(1):259–285, 2022.
- [16] Vijay Krishna. *Auction Theory, Second Edition*. Academic Press, San Diego, 2010.
- [17] Y. T. Lee, A. Sidford, and S. C. Wong. A faster cutting plane method and its implications for combinatorial and convex optimization. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS '15*, pages 1049–1065, 2015.
- [18] Benny Lehmann, Daniel Lehmann, and Noam Nisan. Combinatorial auctions with decreasing marginal utilities. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 55(2):270–296, 2006.

- [19] Pinyan Lu and Tao Xiao. Improved efficiency guarantees in auctions with budgets. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, EC '15, pages 397–413, Portland, 2015.
- [20] Noam Nisan, Tim Roughgarden, Eva Tardos, and Vijay V. Vazirani. *Algorithmic Game Theory*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2007.
- [21] Ryosuke Sato. Polyhedral clinching auctions with a single sample, 2023. [arXiv:2302.03458](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.03458).
- [22] Alexander Schrijver. *Combinatorial Optimization*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003.
- [23] Vasilis Syrgkanis and Eva Tardos. Composable and efficient mechanisms. In *Proceedings of the 45th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '13, pages 211–220, Palo Alto, 2013.

A Proofs in Section 3

A.1 Proof of Proposition 3.2

We first prove Proposition 3.2. Note that in the proof, we do not use Theorem 3.1, which is proved by using this proposition.

Lemma A.1 (See, e.g., Schrijver [22]). Two polymatroids are equal if and only if the monotone submodular functions corresponding to the polymatroids are equal.

Proof of Proposition 3.2. The submodular function $f_{x,d}^{i,u_i} : 2^{N \setminus i} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ that defines $P_{x,d}^i(u_i)$ is defined by $f_{x,d}^{i,u_i}(S) := \min\{f_{x,d}(S), f_{x,d}(S \cup i) - u_i\}$. Thus, by Lemma A.1, the clinching condition $P_{x,d}^i(u_i) = P_{x,d}^i(0)$ is equivalent to $f_{x,d}(S) \leq f_{x,d}(S \cup i) - u_i$ for any $S \subseteq N \setminus i$. Therefore, by the definition of δ_i , we have $\delta_i = \min_{S \subseteq N \setminus i} \{f_{x,d}(S \cup i) - f_{x,d}(S)\} = f_{x,d}(N) - f_{x,d}(N \setminus i)$, where the second equality holds by the submodularity of $f_{x,d}$.

From this and equation (2), we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & f_{x,d}(N) - f_{x,d}(N \setminus i) \\ &= \max(0, \min_{S' \subseteq N} \{f(S') - x(S') + d(N \setminus S')\} - \min_{S'' \subseteq N \setminus i} \{f(S'') - x(S'') + d((N \setminus i) \setminus S'')\}). \end{aligned}$$

Consider two buyers i and k and suppose that i is ordered just before k . When buyer i clinches δ_i amount of goods just before k 's clinching, then both of the values $\min_{S' \subseteq N} \{f(S') - x(S') + d(N \setminus S')\}$ and $\min_{S'' \subseteq N \setminus k} \{f(S'') - x(S'') + d((N \setminus k) \setminus S'')\}$ decrease by δ_i since x_i is updated to $x_i := x_i + \delta_i$ and d_i is updated to $d_i := d_i - \delta_i$. This implies that $f_{x,d}(N) - f_{x,d}(N \setminus k)$ is unchanged by the clinching of buyers numbered before k . Thus, the amount of clinching is independent from the order of buyers. \square

A.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Now we prove Theorem 3.1. We begin by the following lemmata:

Lemma A.2. For each $X, Y \subseteq N$ such that $Y \supseteq X$, it holds $\delta(Y \setminus X) \leq f_{x,d}(Y) - f_{x,d}(X)$.

Proof. We consider the transaction δ_i of buyer i . By Proposition 3.2 and the submodularity of $f_{x,d}$, we have $\delta_i = f_{x,d}(N) - f_{x,d}(N \setminus i) \leq f_{x,d}(S) - f_{x,d}(S \setminus i)$ for each $S \ni i$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(Y \setminus X) &= \sum_{i \in Y \setminus X} (f_{x,d}(N) - f_{x,d}(N \setminus i)) \\ &\leq f_{x,d}(Y) - f_{x,d}(Y \setminus i_1) + f_{x,d}(Y \setminus i_1) - \cdots + f_{x,d}(X \cup i_t) - f_{x,d}(X) \\ &= f_{x,d}(Y) - f_{x,d}(X). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma A.3. At the beginning of the auction, $f_{x,d}(S) = \min_{T \subseteq S} \{f(T) - x(T) + d(S \setminus T)\} = f(S)$ for each $S \subseteq N$.

Proof. At the beginning of the auction, by $x_i = 0$ and $d_i = f(i) + 1$ ($i \in N$), it holds

$$f_{x,d}(S) := \min_{T \subseteq S} \{ \min_{T' \supseteq T} \{f(T')\} + d(S \setminus T) \} = \min_{T \subseteq S} \{f(T) + d(S \setminus T)\},$$

where the second equality holds by the monotonicity of f . In addition, it holds $f(T \cup i) - f(T) \leq f(i) < d_i$ for each $i \in N$ and $T \subseteq N \setminus i$, where the first inequality holds by the submodularity of f . From this and equation (2), we have $f_{x,d}(S) = \min_{T \subseteq S} \{f(T) + d(S \setminus T)\} = f(S)$. Similarly, $\min_{T \subseteq S} \{f(T) - x(T) + d(S \setminus T)\} = \min_{T \subseteq S} \{f(T) + d(S \setminus T)\} = f(S)$. Therefore, we have $f_{x,d}(S) = \min_{T \subseteq S} \{f(T) - x(T) + d(S \setminus T)\} = f(S)$. □

We are ready for the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. At the beginning of the auction, the equation in Theorem 3.1 holds by Lemma A.3. By the following case-by-case analysis, we prove that when the equation in Theorem 3.1 holds for each $S \subseteq N$ at the beginning of a certain iteration, the equation also holds at the end of the iteration.

1. The price update:

Since x and d are unchanged by the price update, it trivially holds

$$f_{x,d}(S) = \min_{T \subseteq S} \{f(T) - x(T) + d(S \setminus T)\}$$

even after the price update.

2. Clinching Step:

By the hypothesis, just before the execution of Algorithm 2, there exists $S^* \subseteq S$ such that $f_{\tilde{x}, \tilde{d}}(S) = f(S^*) - \tilde{x}(S^*) + \tilde{d}(S \setminus S^*)$, where \tilde{x} and \tilde{d} are the allocation of goods and the demands, respectively, just before the execution of Algorithm 2. When buyer $i \in S$ clinches δ_i goods in line 2 of Algorithm 2, this increases \tilde{x}_i by δ_i and decreases \tilde{d}_i by δ_i . Thus, $\min_{S' \subseteq S} \{f(S') - x(S') + d(S \setminus S')\}$ is decreased by $\delta(S)$ through the execution of Algorithm 2 whether the buyers belong to S' or $S \setminus S'$, where x and d are the allocation of goods and the demands, respectively, just after the execution of Algorithm 2. This means that $\min_{S' \subseteq S} \{f(S') - x(S') + d(S \setminus S')\} = \min_{S' \subseteq S} \{f(S') - \tilde{x}(S') + \tilde{d}(S \setminus S')\} - \delta(S) = f_{\tilde{x}, \tilde{d}}(S) - \delta(S)$.

Suppose that the equation does not hold just after the execution of Algorithm 2, then there exists $S^* \subseteq S$ and $S^\dagger \supset S^*$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f_{x,d}(S) &= f(S^\dagger) - x(S^\dagger) + d(S \setminus S^*) \\ &< \min_{S' \subseteq S} \{f(S') - x(S') + d(S \setminus S')\} = f_{\tilde{x}, \tilde{d}}(S) - \delta(S). \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Without loss of generality, we can take $S^* \subseteq S$ and $S^\dagger \supset S^*$ such that $(S^\dagger \setminus S^*) \cap S = \emptyset$. If that is not the case, define $Z := (S^\dagger \setminus S^*) \cap S$ and we have $f(S^\dagger) - x(S^\dagger) + d(S \setminus (S^* \cup Z)) \leq f(S^\dagger) - x(S^\dagger) + d(S \setminus S^*)$.

Thus, we can replace S^* by $S^* \cup Z$. From this, we have $(S^\dagger \setminus S^*) \cap S = \emptyset$. Since it holds $S^\dagger \setminus S^* = S^\dagger \setminus S$ and $f_{x,d}(S) = f(S^\dagger) - x(S^\dagger) + d(S \setminus S^*)$, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{x,d}(S) &= f(S^\dagger) - x(S^\dagger) + d(S \setminus S^*) \\
&\geq \min_{S'' \subseteq S^\dagger \cup S} \{f(S'') - x(S'') + d((S^\dagger \cup S) \setminus S'')\} \\
&= \min_{S'' \subseteq S^\dagger \cup S} \{f(S'') - \tilde{x}(S'') + \tilde{d}((S^\dagger \cup S) \setminus S'')\} - \delta(S^\dagger \cup S) \\
&= f_{\tilde{x},\tilde{d}}(S^\dagger \cup S) - \delta(S^\dagger \cup S),
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where the second equality follows from that when buyer $i \in S^\dagger \cup S$ clinches δ_i goods in line 3 of Algorithm 2, this increases \tilde{x}_i by δ_i and decreases \tilde{d}_i by δ_i . Also, the third equality is from the hypothesis of this theorem. Combining the inequalities (4) and (5), we have

$$f_{\tilde{x},\tilde{d}}(S) - \delta(S) > f_{x,d}(S) \geq f_{\tilde{x},\tilde{d}}(S^\dagger \cup S) - \delta(S^\dagger \cup S).$$

This means $\delta(S^\dagger \setminus S) > f_{\tilde{x},\tilde{d}}(S^\dagger \cup S) - f_{\tilde{x},\tilde{d}}(S)$, which contradicts with Lemma A.2. Therefore, the equation (3.1) also holds just after the execution of Algorithm 2.

3. The demand update:

Suppose that the demand of buyer l changes from d_l to d'_l . Let $d' := (d'_l, d_{-l})$ be the demand after the price increases. Then, it holds

$$f_{x,d'}(S) = \min\{f_{x,d}(S), f_{x,d}(S \setminus l) + d'_l\} = \min_{S' \subseteq S} \{f(S') - x(S') + d'(S \setminus S')\}.$$

Thus, after the demand update in lines 5 and 9 of Algorithm 1, it holds

$$f_{x,d}(S) = \min_{T \subseteq S} \{f(T) - x(T) + d(S \setminus T)\}.$$

□

A.3 Proof of Lemma 3.4

Proof of Lemma 3.4. In Algorithm 1, buyers clinch their allocated goods at the price less than or equal to c , and thus $x_i \geq \lfloor \frac{p_i}{c} \rfloor$. Suppose that $c < v_i$. If i 's demand has been updated in line 9 in the iteration, it holds $d_i = (B_i - p_i)/c \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ just before the update. Then, after the update, it holds $d_i = \frac{B_i - p_i}{c} - 1 = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \lfloor \frac{B_i - p_i}{c + \varepsilon} \rfloor \geq \lfloor \frac{B_i - p_i}{c'} \rfloor$ for any c' with $c' > c$. Otherwise, it holds $d_i = \lfloor \frac{B_i - p_i}{c} \rfloor \geq \frac{B_i - p_i}{c} - 1$ and $d_i = \lfloor \frac{B_i - p_i}{c} \rfloor \geq \lfloor \frac{B_i - p_i}{c'} \rfloor$. Therefore, in both cases, if $c < v_i$, we have $d_i \geq \max(\frac{B_i - p_i}{c} - 1, \lfloor \frac{B_i - p_i}{c'} \rfloor)$ for any c' with $c' > c$. □

A.4 Proof of Proposition 3.5

Proof of Proposition 3.5. We prove that $x(N) + f_{x,d}(N) = \min_{T \subseteq N} \{f(T) + x(N \setminus T) + d(N \setminus T)\}$ is equal to $f(N)$ throughout the execution of Algorithm 1. At the beginning of the auction, by Lemma A.3, we have $x(N) + f_{x,d}(N) = f_{x,d}(N) = f(N)$.

Suppose that $x(N) + f_{x,d}(N) = f(N)$ holds before the execution of Algorithm 2, and buyers clinch $\delta(N)$ amounts of goods in Algorithm 2. Then $x(N)$ increases by $\delta(N)$ and $f_{x,d}(N)$ decreases by $\delta(N)$, and thus $x(N) + f_{x,d}(N) = f(N)$ holds after the execution of Algorithm 2. Moreover, just after the demand update of some buyer l , the value $f_{x,d}(N \setminus l)$ is unchanged. Since it holds $f_{x,d}(N) = f_{x,d}(N \setminus l)$

before the demand update by Lemma 4.11, by the monotonicity of $f_{x,d}(N)$, the value $f_{x,d}(N)$ is also unchanged by the demand update. Then, it holds $x(N) + f_{x,d}(N) = f(N)$ after the update. Thus, we have $x(N) + f_{x,d}(N) = f(N)$ throughout the auction. At the end of the auction, since $d_i = 0$ ($i \in N$), we have $x^f(N) = x^f(N) + f_{x,d}(N) = f(N)$, as required. \square

Note that in the proof, we used Lemma 4.11, which can be proved without using Proposition 3.5.

B Proofs in Section 4

B.1 Proof of Lemma 4.11

Proof of Lemma 4.11. First, we prove that $f_{x,d}(N) = f_{x,d}(N \setminus i)$ holds throughout the auction. At the beginning, the equality holds by $f(N) = f(N \setminus i)$ and Lemma A.3.

In the execution of Algorithm 2 in a certain iteration, it holds $\delta_i = f_{x,d}(N) - f_{x,d}(N \setminus i)$ for each $i \in N$ by Proposition 3.2. Then, we have $f_{x,d}(N) - \delta(N) = f_{x,d}(N) - \delta_i - \delta(N \setminus i) = f_{x,d}(N \setminus i) - \delta(N \setminus i)$, which corresponds to $f_{x,d}(N)$ and $f_{x,d}(N \setminus i)$ after the execution of Algorithm 2, respectively, by (the proof of) Theorem 3.1.

Then, we prove $f_{x,d^{-i}}(N) = f_{x,d}(N)$. For buyer i with $d_i = 0$, it trivially holds $f_{x,d^{-i}}(N) = f_{x,d}(N)$. In addition, for buyer i with $d_i > 0$, by $f_{x,d}(N) = f_{x,d}(N \setminus i) < f_{x,d}(N \setminus i) + d_i$ and equation (2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{x,d}(N) &= \min\left\{\min_{T \subseteq N \setminus i} \left\{\min_{T' \supseteq T} \{f(T' \cup i) - x(T' \cup i)\} + d(N \setminus (T' \cup i))\right\}, f_{x,d}(N \setminus i) + d_i\right\} \\ &= \min_{T \subseteq N \setminus i} \left\{\min_{T' \supseteq T} \{f(T' \cup i) - x(T' \cup i)\} + d(N \setminus (T' \cup i))\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using this and equation (2), we conclude $f_{x,d^{-i}}(N) = \min\left\{\min_{T \subseteq N \setminus i} \left\{\min_{T' \supseteq T} f(T' \cup i) - x(T' \cup i)\right\} + d(N \setminus (T' \cup i))\right\}, f_{x,d}(N \setminus i)\right\} = \min\{f_{x,d}(N), f_{x,d}(N \setminus i)\} = f_{x,d}(N \setminus i)$, where the last equality holds by the monotonicity of $f_{x,d^{-i}}$. \square

B.2 Proofs in Section 4.1

Proof of Lemma 4.3. We prove reflexivity and transitivity, where reflexivity was already pointed out in Goel et al. [12] for their divisible setting.

(1) Reflexivity

By submodularity of $f_{x,d^{-i}}$, it holds $f_{x,d^{-i}}(S) - f_{x,d^{-i}}(S \setminus i) \geq f_{x,d^{-i}}(N) - f_{x,d^{-i}}(N \setminus i)$. By Observation 4.1, it holds $f_{x,d^{-i}}(N \setminus i) = f_{x,d}(N \setminus i)$. By Lemma 4.11, we have $f_{x,d}(N) = f_{x,d^{-i}}(N) = f_{x,d}(N \setminus i)$. Thus, we have $f_{x,d^{-i}}(S) - f_{x,d^{-i}}(S \setminus i) \geq f_{x,d^{-i}}(N) - f_{x,d^{-i}}(N \setminus i) = f_{x,d}(N) - f_{x,d}(N \setminus i) = 0$, where the first inequality holds by the submodularity of $f_{x,d^{-i}}$. The opposite side is obtained by the definition of $f_{x,d^{-i}}$.

(2) Transitivity

It suffices to consider the case that i, j, k are different from each other. Suppose that it holds $i \lesssim j$ and $j \lesssim k$. Then by equation (2), it holds $f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) \leq f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i) + d_i$. It remains to prove the opposite side. By the submodularity, it holds $f_{x,d^{-j}}(N \setminus j) - f_{x,d^{-j}}(N \setminus i, j) \geq f_{x,d^{-j}}(N) - f_{x,d^{-j}}(N \setminus i) = d_i$, where the last equality holds by $i \lesssim j$. Similarly, by $j \lesssim k$, it holds $f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) - f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus j) - d_j = 0$. By the submodularity of $f_{x,d^{-k}}$, we have $f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus j) - f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus j, k) \geq f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) - f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus k) = 0$,

where the last equality holds by reflexivity. Summing these inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d_i &\leq f_{x,d^{-j}}(N \setminus j) - f_{x,d^{-j}}(N \setminus i, j) + f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) - f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus j, k) - d_j \\
&= f_{x,d}(N \setminus j) - f_{x,d}(N \setminus i, j) + f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) - f_{x,d}(N \setminus j, k) - d_j \\
&\leq f_{x,d}(N \setminus i, j) - f_{x,d}(N \setminus i, j) + f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) - f_{x,d}(N \setminus i, j, k) - d_j \\
&= f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) - f_{x,d}(N \setminus i, j, k) - d_j,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds by Observation 4.1, and the second inequality holds by the submodularity of $f_{x,d}$. Then by equation (2) for $f_{x,d}$, it holds $f_{x,d}(N \setminus i, j, k) + d_j \geq f_{x,d}(N \setminus i, k)$. Also, by Observation 4.1 and the reflexivity, $f_{x,d}(N \setminus i, k) = f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i, k) \geq f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i)$. Therefore, we have $d_i \leq f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) - f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i, j, k) - d_j \leq f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) - f_{x,d}(N \setminus i, k) \leq f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) - f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i)$, which means $i \lesssim k$. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.4. By $i \lesssim k$ and $k \lesssim k$, $f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) = f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i) + d_i = f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i, k) + d_i$. Also, by equation (2) and Observation 4.1, it holds $f_{x,d}(N \setminus i) \leq f_{x,d}(N \setminus i, k) + d_k = f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i, k) + d_k$. Since it holds $f_{x,d}(N \setminus i) = f_{x,d^{-k}}(N)$ by Lemma 4.11, we have $d_k \geq d_i$. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.5. Let \tilde{z} be the solution of $\max_{z \in P_{x,d^{-k}}} \mathbf{1}^t z$ that minimizes z_i . It means \tilde{z} is the solution of $\max_{z \in P_{x,d^{-k}}} \mathbf{1}^t z$ that maximizes $\max_{z \in P_{x,d^{-k}}} \mathbf{1}_{-i}^t z_{-i}$. Since $P_{x,d^{-k}}$ is a polymatroid, \tilde{z} can be obtained by the greedy algorithm, where each coordinate is increased up to the feasibility constraints and i is set to be the last coordinate. Thus, we have $\tilde{z}_i = f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) - f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i)$. Therefore, $i \lesssim k$ if and only if $f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) - f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i) = d_i^{-k}$.

By $i \lesssim j$ and the submodularity of $f_{x,d^{-j}}$, we have $f_{x,d^{-j}}(S) - f_{x,d^{-j}}(S \setminus i) \geq f_{x,d^{-j}}(N) - f_{x,d^{-j}}(N \setminus i) = d_i$. Since the opposite side can easily be obtained by the definition of $f_{x,d^{-j}}(S)$ (equation (2)), the inequality holds in equality. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.6. By reflexivity, it suffices to consider the case of $i \neq k$. By definition of $f_{x,d}$ and $d_i = 0$, it holds $f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) \leq f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i) + d_i = f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i)$. Then, by $k \lesssim k$ and Observation 4.1, it holds $f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) - f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i) = f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus k) - f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i, k) = f_{x,d}(N \setminus k) - f_{x,d}(N \setminus i, k)$. By Theorem 3.1, since $f_{x,d}$ is monotone, we have $f_{x,d}(N \setminus k) - f_{x,d}(N \setminus i, k) \geq 0$. Thus, it also holds $f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) \geq f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i)$. Since $d_i = 0$, we have $f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) = f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i) = f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i) + d_i$, and thus $i \lesssim k$ holds. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.7. If $i \lesssim k$, it holds $f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) - f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i) = d_i$. Also by $k \lesssim k$ and Observation 4.1, it holds $f_{x,d^{-k}}(N) = f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus k) = f_{x,d}(N \setminus k)$. Therefore, we have $f_{x,d}(N \setminus k) = f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i) + d_i$. Then, let d' be the demand after the i 's demand update, it holds $f_{x,d'}(N \setminus k) = \min(f_{x,d}(N \setminus k), f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i) + d'_i) = f_{x,d}(N \setminus k) - (d_i - d'_i)$. On the other hand, by Proposition 3.5, it holds $f_{x,d}(N) = f(N) - x(N)$ and it is independent from d , we have $f_{x,d}(N) = f_{x,d'}(N)$. Also, by Lemma 4.11, it holds $f_{x,d}(N) = f_{x,d}(N \setminus k)$. Thus, for the transaction of buyer k , it holds $\delta_k = f_{x,d'}(N) - f_{x,d'}(N \setminus k) = f_{x,d}(N \setminus k) - (f_{x,d}(N \setminus k) - (d_i - d'_i)) = d_i - d'_i$. Note that if $i \lesssim k$ does not hold, it holds $f_{x,d}(N \setminus k) < f_{x,d^{-k}}(N \setminus i) + d_i$, which implies $\delta_k < d_i - d'_i$. \square

C Proofs in Section 5

C.1 Proofs in Section 5.1

Proof of Lemma 5.2. We construct $\{\theta_k\}_{k \in \{1,2,\dots,t\}}$ in the following way:

If $\phi_{i_1} = v_{i_1}$, then θ_1 is defined by $\theta_1 := \phi_{i_1}$. Otherwise, θ_1 is defined such that $\phi_{i_1} < \theta_1$ and $\theta_1 < v_j$ for any j with $\phi_{i_1} < v_j$. Then, it holds $\phi_{i_1} = \theta_1 = v_{i_1}$ or $\phi_{i_1} < \theta_1 < v_{i_1}$. For each $k = 2, \dots, t$, we define θ_k as follows:

- (i) If $\phi_{i_k} < v_{i_k}$ and $\phi_{i_k} < \phi_{i_{k-1}}$, then θ_k is defined as a constant satisfying $\phi_{i_k} < \theta_k < \theta_{k-1}$ and $\theta_k < v_j$ for any j with $\phi_{i_k} < v_j$. In this case, it holds $\phi_{i_k} < \theta_k < v_{i_k}$.
- (ii) If $\phi_{i_k} < v_{i_k}$ and $\phi_{i_k} = \phi_{i_{k-1}}$, this case occurs in the same iteration as case (i). Thus, it holds $v_{i_k} > \theta_{k-1}$. Thus, by defining $\theta_k = \theta_{k-1}$, we have $\phi_{i_k} = \phi_{i_{k-1}} < \theta_{k-1} = \theta_k < v_{i_k}$.
- (iii) If $\phi_{i_k} = v_{i_k}$, then θ_k is set to ϕ_{i_k} . In this case, it holds $\phi_{i_k} = \theta_k = v_{i_k}$.

Therefore, we can construct $\{\theta_k\}_{k \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}}$ satisfying $\phi_{i_k} = \theta_k = v_{i_k}$ or $\phi_{i_k} < \theta_k < v_{i_k}$ for each k . \square

Proof of Lemma 5.3. We consider the following case-by-case analysis.

- (i) Suppose that $\phi_{i_k} = \theta_k = v_{i_k}$ and $i \in X_k \setminus (X_{k-1} \cup i_k)$. If $x_i^f \geq x'_i$, then it holds $\theta_k(x_i^f - x'_i) \leq v_i(x_i^f - x'_i) \leq p_i^f - p'_i$. Otherwise, by $v_{i_k} = \phi_{i_k}$ and Property (iii) of Theorem 4.9, it holds $\frac{B_i - p_i^f}{\phi_i} < 1$. By $p'_i \leq B_i < p_i^f + \phi_i = p_i^f + \phi_{i_k} = p_i^f + \theta_k$ and $x^f < x'_i$, we have $\theta_k(x_i^f - x'_i) \leq -\theta_k < p_i^f - p'_i$.
- (ii) Suppose that $\phi_{i_k} < \theta_k < v_{i_k}$ and $i \in X_k \setminus (X_{k-1} \cup i_k)$. If $x_i^f \geq x'_i$, then it holds $\theta_k(x_i^f - x'_i) < v_i(x_i^f - x'_i) \leq p_i^f - p'_i$. Otherwise, by $p'_i \leq B_i \leq p_i^f + \phi_i = p_i^f + \phi_{i_k} < p_i^f + \theta_k$ and $x^f < x'_i$, we have $\theta_k(x_i^f - x'_i) \leq -\theta_k < p_i^f - p'_i$.
- (iii) Consider i_k with $\phi_{i_k} < \theta_k < v_{i_k}$. If $x_{i_k}^f \geq x'_{i_k}$, then it holds $\theta_k(x_{i_k}^f - x'_{i_k}) < v_{i_k}(x_{i_k}^f - x'_{i_k}) \leq p_{i_k}^f - p'_{i_k}$. Otherwise, by $p'_{i_k} \leq B_{i_k} \leq p_{i_k}^f + \phi_{i_k} = p_{i_k}^f + \phi_{i_k} < p_{i_k}^f + \theta_k$ and $x^f < x'_{i_k}$, we have $\theta_k(x_{i_k}^f - x'_{i_k}) \leq -\theta_k < p_{i_k}^f - p'_{i_k}$.
- (iv) Consider i_k with $\phi_{i_k} = \theta_k = v_{i_k}$. It holds $\theta_k(x_{i_k}^f - x'_{i_k}) = v_{i_k}(x_{i_k}^f - x'_{i_k}) \leq p_{i_k}^f - p'_{i_k}$.

From the above, we have $\theta_k(x_i^f - x'_i) \leq p_i^f - p'_i$ for each k . Moreover, if all the inequalities holds in equality, we have $\phi_{i_k} = \theta_k = v_{i_k}$ and $x_i^f \geq x'_i$ for each $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ and $i \in X_k \setminus (X_{k-1} \cup i_k)$. \square

C.2 Proofs in Section 5.2

C.2.1 Proof of Proposition 5.6

For the proof of Proposition 5.6, we first consider the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{i' \in N'} v_{i'} \min(x_{i'}, \frac{B_{i'}}{v_{i'}}) \\ & \text{subject to} && x \in P(f') \cap \mathbb{Z}^{N'}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Indeed, we can find a optimal solution for problem (6) by solving

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{i' \in N'} v_{i'} x_{i'} \\ & \text{subject to} && x \in P_{d'}(f') \cap \mathbb{Z}^{N'}, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $d' := \{\frac{B_{i'}}{v_{i'}} \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{\infty\} \mid i' \in N'\}$ and $P_{d'}(f') := \{y \in P(f') \mid y_{i'} \leq d'_{i'} (i' \in N')\}$. Note that $P_{d'}(f')$ is a reduction of an integer polymatroid by an integer vector d' and is again an integer

polymatroid; see Section 3.1 of Fujishige [10]. Then, the problem (7) is a linear optimization on polymatroids, known to be solved efficiently by a greedy procedure; see Section 3.2 of Fujishige [10]. Thus, we obtain the optimal allocation $x^* \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{N'}$ by allocating as many goods as possible in descending order of buyers' valuations according to the polymatroid constraints. Therefore, we have $x_{i'}^* = f'_{d'}(H_{i'} \cup i') - f'_{d'}(H_{i'})$, where $f'_{d'} : 2^{N'} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ is a monotone submodular function that defines $P_{d'}$, and is defined by $f'_{d'}(S) = \min_{S' \subseteq S} \{f'(S \setminus S') + d'(S')\}$ for each $S \subseteq N'$.

Then, we show that an optimal solution x^* of (7) is recursively obtained by the following:

$$x_{i'}^* = \min\left(\frac{B_{i'}}{v_{i'}}, \min_{H \subseteq H_{i'}} \{f(H \cup i') - x^*(H)\}\right) \quad (i' \in N').$$

We prove this using the same idea that Sato [21] used in the proof of their Proposition 2.1. Suppose that $f'_{d'}(H_{i'} \cup i') = f'(H) + d'(H_{i'} \setminus H) + d'_{i'}$ for some $H \subseteq H_{i'}$. Then, we have $f'_{d'}(H_{i'}) = \min_{H' \subseteq H_{i'}} \{f'(H_{i'} \setminus H') + d'(H')\} = f'(H) + d'(H_{i'} \setminus H)$. Therefore, we have $x_{i'}^* = f'_{d'}(H_{i'} \cup i') - f'_{d'}(H_{i'}) = d'_{i'}$.

Suppose that $f'_{d'}(H_{i'} \cup i') = f'(H \cup i') + d'(H_{i'} \setminus H)$ for some $H \subseteq H_{i'}$. Then, we have

$$d'(H_{i'} \setminus H) = f'_{d'}(H_{i'} \cup i') - f'(H \cup i') \leq f'_{d'}(H_{i'} \cup i') - f'_{d'}(H \cup i') \leq f'_{d'}(H_{i'}) - f'_{d'}(H).$$

Note that the first inequality holds by the definition of $f'_{d'}$, and the second inequality holds by the submodularity of $f'_{d'}$. By $x^* \in P_{d'}(f')$, it holds $x^*(H) \leq f'_{d'}(H)$ and $x_{i'}^* \leq B_{i'}/v_{i'} = d'_{i'}$ for each $i \in N$. In the above greedy procedure, we have $x^*(H_{i'}) = f'_{d'}(H_{i'})$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} x^*(H_{i'}) &= x^*(H) + x^*(H_{i'} \setminus H) \leq f'_{d'}(H) + d'(H_{i'} \setminus H) \\ &\leq f'_{d'}(H) + (f'_{d'}(H_{i'}) - f'_{d'}(H)) = f'_{d'}(H_{i'}) = x^*(H_{i'}). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that all the inequalities in the above hold in equality. From this, we have $x^*(H) = f'_{d'}(H)$ and $x^*(H_{i'} \setminus H) = d'(H_{i'} \setminus H)$. Then, we have

$$x_{i'}^* = f'_{d'}(H_{i'} \cup i') - f'_{d'}(H_{i'}) = f'(H \cup i') + d'(H_{i'} \setminus H) - x^*(H_{i'}) = f'(H \cup i') - x^*(H).$$

In this case, $x_{i'}^*$ is calculated as the minimum of $f'(H \cup i) - x^*(H)$ with respect to $H \subseteq H_{i'}$.

Therefore, we obtain

$$x_{i'}^* = \min\left(\frac{B_{i'}}{v_{i'}}, \min_{H \subseteq H_{i'}} \{f(H \cup i') - x^*(H)\}\right) \quad (i' \in N') \quad (8)$$

as an optimal solution of (6) and (7).

In the following, we prove that the optimal solution (8) is also an optimal solution for the LW maximizing problem.

Proof of Proposition 5.6. The LW maximizing problem can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{maximize} && \sum_{i \in N} \min(v_i x_i, B_i) \\ &\text{subject to} && x \in P(f) \cap \mathbb{Z}^N. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Since $x \in \mathbb{Z}^N$, for the objective function, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in N} \min(v_i x_i, B_i) &= \sum_{i \in N} \left(v_i \min\left(x_i, \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor\right) + (B_i - v_i \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor) \min\left(\max\left(x_i - \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor, 0\right), 1\right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i \in N} \left(v_{i_a} \min\left(x_i, \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor\right) + v_{i_b} \min\left(\max\left(x_i - \left\lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \right\rfloor, 0\right), 1\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

For a vector $\tilde{x}' \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$, construct an allocation of virtual buyers by $x'_{i_a} = \min(\tilde{x}'_i, \lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \rfloor)$ and $x'_{i_b} = \tilde{x}'_i - x'_{i_a}$ for each $i \in N$. Since $x'_{i_a} + x'_{i_b} = \tilde{x}'_i$ for each $i \in N$, it holds that $x \in P(f)$ if and only if $x' \in P(f')$. Then, the allocation of virtual buyers obtained from an optimal solution of (9) is a feasible solution of the problem (6), where the value of the objective function is unchanged between (6) and (9). Moreover, for an optimal allocation $x^* \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{N'}$ of (6) obtained by (8), define $\tilde{x}^*_i = x^*_{i_a} + x^*_{i_b}$ for each $i \in N$. Then, \tilde{x}^* is a feasible solution of (9), where the objective function is unchanged between (6) and (9) by Lemma 5.8. Thus, since $x'_{i_a} = \min(\tilde{x}'_i, \lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \rfloor) \leq \lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \rfloor$ by the construction, the optimization problem (9) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{i \in N} (v_{i_a} \min(x'_{i_a}, \lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \rfloor) + v_{i_b} \min(x'_{i_b}, 1)), \\ & \text{subject to} && x' \in P(f') \cap \mathbb{Z}^{N'}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{B_{i_a}}{v_{i_a}} = \lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \rfloor \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\frac{B_{i_b}}{v_{i_b}} = 1 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ for each $i \in N$, we can find an optimal solution for problem (9) by finding an optimal solution for (6). Thus, using the optimal virtual allocation $x^* \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{N'}$ in (8), we obtain the optimal allocation as $\tilde{x}^*_i = x^*_{i_a} + x^*_{i_b}$ for each $i \in N$. \square

C.2.2 Remaining Proofs in Section 5.2

Proof of Lemma 5.9. If $x_i^f \geq \tilde{x}_i^*$, then $v_i x_i^f - (v_{i_a} x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^*) \geq v_i (x_i^f - \tilde{x}_i^*) \geq \phi_i (x_i^f - \tilde{x}_i^*)$ by $v_i = v_{i_a} \geq v_{i_b}$. If $x_i^f < \tilde{x}_i^*$ and $v_i = \phi_i$, it holds $v_i x_i^f - (v_{i_a} x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^*) \geq v_i (x_i^f - \tilde{x}_i^*) = \phi_i (x_i^f - \tilde{x}_i^*)$. If $x_i^f < \tilde{x}_i^*$ and $v_i > \phi_i$, by Proposition 5.7, it holds $x_i^f = x_{i_a}^* = \lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \rfloor$, $x_{i_b}^* = 1$, and $v_{i_b} \leq \phi_i$. Thus, it holds $v_i x_i^f - (v_{i_a} x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^*) = -v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^* \geq -\phi_i x_{i_b}^* = \phi_i (x_i^f - \tilde{x}_i^*)$. Therefore, it holds $v_i x_i^f - (v_{i_a} x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^*) \geq \phi_i (x_i^f - \tilde{x}_i^*)$ for each $i \in N$.

Suppose that $v_i > \phi_i$ for buyer i with $x_i^f < \tilde{x}_i^*$. Then, by Proposition 5.7, it holds $x_i^f = x_{i_a}^* = \lfloor \frac{B_i}{v_i} \rfloor$, $x_{i_b}^* = 1$, and $v_{i_b} \leq \phi_i$. Thus, $\min(v_i x_i^f, B_i) - \min(v_i \tilde{x}_i^*, B_i) = -v_{i_b} = -(\phi_i x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^* - \phi_i x_i^f)$. Suppose that $v_i = \phi_i = v_{i_a}$ for buyer i with $x_i^f < \tilde{x}_i^*$. If $v_i x_i^f < v_i \tilde{x}_i^* \leq B_i$, it holds $\min(v_i x_i^f, B_i) - \min(v_i \tilde{x}_i^*, B_i) = v_i (x_i^f - \tilde{x}_i^*) \leq -(\phi_i x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^* - \phi_i x_i^f)$ by $v_i = \phi_i > v_{i_b}$. If $v_i x_i^f \leq B_i < v_i \tilde{x}_i^*$, it holds $\min(v_i x_i^f, B_i) - \min(v_i \tilde{x}_i^*, B_i) = v_i x_i^f - B_i \leq -(v_{i_a} x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^* - \phi_i x_i^f) = -(\phi_i x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^* - \phi_i x_i^f)$ by Proposition 5.6 and the definition of v_{i_b} . Note that $B_i < v_i x_i^f < v_i \tilde{x}_i^*$ implies $\tilde{x}_i^* \geq x_i^f + 1 > \frac{B_i}{v_i} + 1 \geq x_{i_a}^* + x_{i_b}^*$, which never happens by Proposition 5.6. Therefore, it holds $\min(v_i x_i^f, B_i) - \min(v_i \tilde{x}_i^*, B_i) \leq -(\phi_i x_{i_a}^* + v_{i_b} x_{i_b}^* - \phi_i x_i^f)$ for each buyer $i \in N$ with $x_i^f < \tilde{x}_i^*$. \square