

# Almost Envy-free Allocation of Indivisible Goods: A Tale of Two Valuations

Alireza Kaviani\*      Masoud Seddighin†      AmirMohammad Shahrezaei\*

## Abstract

The existence of EFX allocations stands as one of the main challenges in discrete fair division. In this paper, we present a collection of symmetrical results on the existence of EFX notion and its approximate variations. These results pertain to two seemingly distinct valuation settings: the restricted additive valuations and  $(p, q)$ -bounded valuations recently introduced by Christodoulou *et al.* [27]. In a  $(p, q)$ -bounded instance, each good holds relevance (i.e., has a non-zero marginal value) for at most  $p$  agents, and any pair of agents share at most  $q$  common relevant goods. The only known guarantees on  $(p, q)$ -bounded valuations is that  $(2, 1)$ -bounded instances always admit EFX allocations (EC'22) [27]. Here we show that instances with  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded valuations always admit EF2X allocations, and EFX allocations with at most  $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1$  discarded goods. These results mirror the existing results for the restricted additive setting [2]. Moreover, we present  $(\sqrt{2}/2)$ -EFX allocation algorithms for both the restricted additive and  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded settings.

The symmetry of these results suggests that these valuations exhibit symmetric structures. Building on this observation, we conjectured that the  $(2, \infty)$ -bounded and restricted additive setting might admit EFX guarantee. Intriguingly, our investigation confirms this conjecture. We propose a rather complex EFX allocation algorithm for restricted additive valuations when  $p = 2$  and  $q = \infty$ . You can find a summary of our results in Table 1.

## 1 Introduction

Fair division is a longstanding problem in mathematics and economics [9, 16, 17, 30, 31, 44, 45]. It explores finding methods to allocate a resource in a way that ensures each party receives a fair share. The modern research on the fair division problem was initiated by Steinhaus in 1945 with the introduction of the cake-cutting problem [44]. This problem involves cutting and dividing a heterogeneous divisible resource among a set of agents with different preferences such that each individual believes her share is fair. Since the introduction of cake-cutting, numerous notions have emerged to gauge fairness, e.g., proportionality, envy-freeness, and equity. Fortunately, scientists have significantly advanced in providing guarantees for these criteria; see [17] for an overview of these results.

Over the past two decades, a discrete version of the cake-cutting problem, commonly known as fair allocation, has garnered interest among computer scientists [2, 12, 15, 18, 21, 34, 39, 40]. In the fair allocation problem, rather than dealing with a divisible cake, the resource is a collection of indivisible goods. Fair allocation of indivisible goods includes a multitude of intriguing unresolved questions. In this paper, we investigate one of the most challenging ones: envy-freeness up to

---

\*Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran

†Tehran Institute for Advanced Studies (TeIAS), Tehran, Iran

any good or EFX; to quote Ariel Procaccia, it is "Fair Division's Most Enigmatic Question" [43]. Consider a set  $M$  of indivisible goods and  $n$  agents. Each agent  $i$  has a monotone valuation function  $v_i : 2^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$  that assigns a non-negative value to each possible subset of goods. Assume we allocate bundle  $X_i$  to agent  $i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . This allocation is EFX, if for every  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ ,

$$\forall_{X'_j \subset X_j} \quad v_i(X_i) \geq v_i(X'_j). \quad (1)$$

EFX is, indeed, a relaxation of a more stringent notion called "envy-freeness". In an envy-free allocation, each agent prefers their bundle over any other agent's, which means (1) must continue to hold even when  $X'_j = X_j$ . While it is easy to find examples that disprove the existence of envy-free allocations, it is still an open question whether it is always possible to achieve EFX allocations. As of now, we know that EFX allocations exist only in a few limited scenarios. For instance, when we have two agents with monotone valuations, we can always find an EFX allocation [41]. A similar result holds for three agents, where the valuations of two parties are monotone, and the valuation of one agent is *MMS-feasible* [2, 23]. There are also some guarantees proved for an arbitrary number of agents. For additive valuations, we can always guarantee 0.618-EFX (0.618 approximation of EFX) [5, 33].<sup>1</sup> Moreover, for monotone subadditive valuations, an EFX allocation exists that discards at most  $n - 1$  goods [25]. For a comprehensive overview of these results, refer to Section 4.

In recent advances related to EFX allocations, our focus has been drawn to two separate studies that provide EFX guarantees in distinct scenarios. The first study, conducted by Christodoulou *et al.* [27], introduces a family of valuation functions where each good holds relevance (i.e., has a non-zero marginal value) for at most  $p$  agents, and any pair of agents share at most  $q$  common relevant goods. There are several real-word motivations for this setting. Suppose agents and resources are located in a geographical area, and agents are only interested in nearby resources. Examples include allocating office space in academic settings, disaster response planning, and delineating "areas of influence" among neighboring powers throughout history [27].

Christodoulou *et al.* [27] present an EFX allocation for the case where  $p = 2$  and  $q = 1$ , leaving the more general cases as open directions:

"Unless one can solve the basic question if EFX allocations always exist – partial progress can possibly be made for larger values of  $p$  and  $q$ ."

In the second study, Akrami *et al.* [2] consider EFX allocations for the restricted additive valuation family, where the valuations are additive, but the value of every good  $g$  for every agent is restricted to be either 0 or  $v_g$ . The restricted additive setting is a well-established class of valuation functions that is suspected to be equally challenging as the additive setting for some allocation problems [38]. Restricted additive valuations have been extensively studied for different allocation problems, particularly for the maximin fairness notion, which is commonly known as the Santa Claus problem. For a detailed discussion on the significance and applications of the restricted additive valuations, refer to [3].

Akrami *et al.* prove the existence of EF2X allocations for the restricted additive setting. An allocation  $\langle X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \rangle$  is EF2X, if for every agent  $i$  and  $j$  we have

$$\forall_{X'_j \subset X_j, |X'_j| \leq |X_j| - 2} \quad v_i(X_i) \geq v_i(X'_j). \quad (2)$$

In this paper, we uncover intriguing parallels between these two seemingly different settings — the restricted additive setting and  $(p, q)$ -bounded valuations. In Table 1 you can find a summary

---

<sup>1</sup>We refer to Section 2 for a formal definition of  $\beta$ -EFX.

of our results. The results we obtained in this paper, along with those from [27] and [3], form a symmetric set of results:

when  $p$  is either 2 or  $\infty$ , every allocation algorithm with EFX,EF2X, or approximate EFX guarantees obtained for  $(p, 1)$ -bounded valuations has a corresponding algorithm with the same guarantee for  $(p, \infty)$ -bounded valuations with the restricted additive property.

The algorithms we use in our work introduce several techniques and ideas that may be of independent interest. In particular, we revisit the concept of rank introduced by Farhadi *et al.* [33] and, based on this concept, introduce the virtual welfare of the agents for an allocation, which may be of independent interest. You can find a detailed explanation of these techniques in Section 3. These results can serve as a building block for providing guarantees for larger values of  $p$  and  $q$ . We note that Graphical models like  $(p, q)$ -bounded valuations are commonly used as a middle ground to pave the way toward proving more general results. This approach has already been used to achieve strong results in algorithmic game theory, such as the complexity of Nash equilibrium [26, 28]. In Section 3, we also discuss possible directions to extend these results.

## 2 Basic Concepts

Every allocation problem instance is represented as a triple  $\mathcal{I} = (N, M, \mathcal{V})$ , where  $N$  is a set of  $n$  agents,  $M$  is a set of  $m$  goods, and  $\mathcal{V}$  is the set of valuation functions. We refer to agents by their index from 1 to  $n$  and use the variable  $g$  to refer to a good. Our results in this paper relate to two types of valuation functions. Let us first define them formally.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$  be a set of additive valuation functions where for every  $i$ ,  $v_i : 2^M \rightarrow R^{\geq 0}$ . We say  $\mathcal{V}$  is restricted additive, if for every good  $g$  and every  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , we have  $v_i(\{g\}) \in \{0, v_g\}$ . For convenience, for every subset  $S$  of goods, we define  $v(S) = \sum_{g \in S} v_g$ .

The second type of valuations we study is  $(p, q)$ -bounded valuations.

**Definition 2.2.** [Chiristodoulou *et al.* [27]] Let  $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$  be a set of monotone valuation functions where for every  $i$ ,  $v_i : 2^M \rightarrow R^{\geq 0}$ . We say that a good  $g$  is not relevant to agent  $i$  if

$$\forall X_i \subseteq M \setminus \{g\}, v_i(X_i \cup \{g\}) = v_i(X_i),$$

and relevant otherwise. We say  $\mathcal{V}$  is  $(p, q)$ -bounded, if every good is relevant to at most  $p$  agents, and furthermore, for every pair of agents, there are at most  $q$  goods relevant to both of them.

Note that, the valuations in  $\mathcal{V}$  are not necessarily additive; we only require them to be monotone. Here, we consider a slightly adjusted variant with an additional assumption that the valuations are strictly monotone for relevant goods. That is, for every  $v_i$  and a relevant good  $g$ , we have

$$\forall X_i \subseteq M \setminus \{g\}, v_i(X_i \cup \{g\}) - v_i(X_i) > 0.$$

For a set  $S$  of goods, we define  $S[i]$  as a subset of goods in  $S$  that are relevant to agent  $i$ :

$$S[i] = \{g \mid g \in S \text{ and } v_i(\{g\}) > 0\}. \quad (3)$$

Accordingly, we define  $S[i, j]$  as the set of goods in  $S$  that are relevant both to agent  $i$  and agent  $j$ . Note that, these definitions are applicable to both  $(p, q)$ -bounded and restricted additive valuations.

Christodoulou *et al.* [27] prove the existence of EFX allocation in a specific case that  $p = 2$  and  $q = 1$ . This case can be modeled by a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , where  $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$  represent the agents, and each edge refers to a good. An edge  $(i, j)$  indicates that the good is relevant only to agents  $i$  and  $j$ . Here, we consider a more general case, where  $p = \infty$  and  $q = 1$ . We can represent this case as a hypergraph, where the vertices are the agents, and each edge corresponds to a good. The agents connected to an edge are relevant to the good corresponding to that edge. Since  $p = 1$ , each pair of edges can have at most one vertex in common.

**An allocation** is a partition of goods into  $n + 1$  bundles  $\langle X_0, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n \rangle$ , where for every  $1 \leq i \leq n$  bundle  $X_i$  is the share of agent  $i$ , and bundle  $X_0$  is the set of unallocated goods. We sometimes refer to  $X_0$  as the pool. Allocation  $X$  is complete, if  $X_0 = \emptyset$ , and partial otherwise.

Let  $\beta \in [1, +\infty]$  be a constant. For a given allocation  $X$ , we say that agent  $i$   $\beta$ -envies bundle  $X_j$  if  $\beta v_i(X_i) < v_i(X_j)$ . Additionally, agent  $i$   $\beta$ -strongly envies bundle  $X_j$  if, for every good  $g \in X_j$ , we have  $\beta v_i(X_i) < v_i(X_j \setminus g)$ . An allocation is  $(1/\beta)$ -EFX if no agent  $\beta$ -strongly envies any other agent. For simplicity, when  $\beta = 1$ , we drop the prefix and use terms envy, strongly envy, and EFX instead of 1-envy, 1-strongly envy, and 1-EFX. We also consider another relaxation of the EFX known as EF2X. In an EF2X allocation, any envy that an agent  $i$  may have towards  $X_j$  must disappear after removing any two goods from  $X_j$ . Formally, for every agent  $i$  and bundle  $X_j$ , we have:

$$\forall_{g, g' \in X_j} \quad v_i(X_i) \geq v_i(X_j \setminus \{g, g'\}).$$

## Weighted Envy Graph, Rank, and Virtual Value.

The weighted envy graph is a flexible structure that includes several meaningful graphs relating to EFX allocations as a subgraph. In this paper, we utilize several induced subgraphs of the weighted envy graph in different sections.

**Definition 2.3.** *Given an allocation  $X$ , we define the weighted envy graph of  $X$ , denoted by  $G_X$  as a complete weighted bidirectional graph with  $n$  vertices. For every pair  $i$  and  $j$  of vertices, there is a directed edge from  $i$  to  $j$  with weight  $w_X(i, j) = v_i(X_j)/v_i(X_i)$ . If  $v_i(X_j) = v_i(X_i) = 0$ , we ignore that edge.*

By definition, when  $w_X(i, j) > 1$ , agent  $i$  envies agent  $j$ . Note that the edges in  $G_X$  might have weight  $+\infty$ , which occurs when an agent values her bundle as 0. To prevent such situations, we initiate our algorithms with a special allocation, which we refer to as the basic feasible allocation.

**Definition 2.4.** *Allocation  $X$  is a basic feasible allocation, if for every  $i$ ,  $|X_i| = 1$ , and  $\Pi_i v_i(X_i)$  is maximized.*

Indeed, in the basic feasible allocation, we allocate one item to each agent, such that the Nash welfare is maximized. Lemma 2.5 states that we can assume without loss of generality that in the basic feasible allocation, every agent has a non-zero value for her allocated item, which means the Nash welfare of the allocation is non-zero.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Assume  $\mathcal{I} = (N, M, \mathcal{V})$  is an allocation instance, and let  $X$  be a basic feasible allocation. If for some agent  $i$ ,  $v_i(X_i) = 0$ , then there exists another instance  $\mathcal{I}' = (N', M', \mathcal{V}')$  with  $|N'| < |N|$ , such that any  $\alpha$ -EFX or  $\alpha$ -EF2X guarantee for  $\mathcal{I}'$  implies the same guarantee for  $\mathcal{I}$ .*

**Proof.** If for some agent  $i$ ,  $v_i(X_i) = 0$ , then by Hall's theorem [36], we know that there exists a constrained set  $N_c$  of agents such that  $|M[N_c]| < |N_c|$ . Since agents in  $N_c$  value every good in  $M \setminus M[N_c]$  zero, we can match the goods in  $M[N_c]$  to  $N_c$  (at most one good to each agent)

and recursively find an allocation with the desired guarantee for instance  $\mathcal{I}' = (N', M', \mathcal{V}')$  where  $N' = N \setminus N_c$ ,  $M' = M \setminus M[N_c]$  and  $\mathcal{V}'$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{V}$  containing the valuation functions of the agents in  $N'$ . One can easily check that combining this allocation with the initial matching preserves the guarantee.  $\square$

We also define the **rank** of an agent for an allocation  $X$  as follows.

**Definition 2.6.** *Given an allocation  $X$ , assume  $v_i(X_i) > 0$  for every agent  $i$ , and that  $G_X$  has no cycle with a total product of edge weights greater than 1. The rank of agent  $i$  in  $G_X$ , denoted by  $\mathfrak{R}_i(X)$ , is defined as the maximum product of edge weights along any path ending at vertex  $i$ :*

$$\mathfrak{R}_i(X) = \max_{p \in P_i} \prod_{e \in p} w_X(e),$$

where  $P_i$  is the set of all paths in  $G_X$  ending at vertex  $i$ . Also, we define the **rankpath** of agent  $i$  as:

$$\arg \max_{p \in P_i} \prod_{e \in p} w_X(e),$$

and the first vertex in the rankpath of vertex  $i$  is referred to as the root of vertex  $i$ , denoted by  $\text{root}(i, X)$ . If there are multiple such paths, the path whose root has the smallest index is selected as the rankpath. By definition, for every vertex  $i$ ,  $\text{root}(i, X)$  has rank 1.

The idea of rank is very helpful in our allocation algorithms. This concept was initially introduced by Farhadi *et al.* [33]. Here, we explore this concept and uncover several intriguing implications of rank. In particular, we employ this concept to define the virtual value of each agent.

**Definition 2.7.** *Let  $X$  be an allocation such that for every agent  $i$ ,  $v_i(X_i) > 0$  and also  $G_X$  has no cycle with a total product of edges greater than 1. For every agent  $i$ , we define the virtual value of agent  $i$  for allocation  $X$  as*

$$\mathbf{v}_i(X) = \frac{v_i(X_i)}{\mathfrak{R}_i(X)}.$$

It's important to note that the virtual value of each agent is also dependent on the bundle of other agents. We will give more insights on the virtual value in Section 3. Our allocation algorithms are designed in a way that each agent compares their virtual value with the actual values of the other agents. Accordingly, we say agent  $i$  virtually envies agent  $j$  in allocation  $X$ , if  $\mathbf{v}_i(X) < v_i(X_j)$ . In the same way, we define terms virtually strong envy and virtually EFX.

Definitions 2.6 and 2.7 are only well-defined for allocations where the weighted envy graph has no cycles with a total product of weights greater than 1. Thus, it is essential to ensure that this property holds throughout our algorithms. Here, we provide a necessary and sufficient condition for  $G_X$  to satisfy this property. Consider the following linear program:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Minimize} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i \\ \forall_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \quad & \tau_i w_X(i, j) \leq \tau_j \\ \forall_{1 \leq i \leq n} \quad & \tau_i \geq 1 \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where  $w_X(i, j)$  is the weight of the edge from  $i$  to  $j$  in  $G_X$ . We prove that if LP(4) is feasible, then  $G_X$  has no cycle with a weight product strictly greater than 1.

**Lemma 2.8.** *Given an allocation  $X$  such that LP(4) is feasible for  $G_X$ . Then,  $G_X$  admits no cycle with a total weight product strictly greater than 1.*

**Proof.** Consider a cycle  $i_1 \rightarrow i_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow i_k \rightarrow i_1$  in  $G_X$ . For each edge  $i_l \rightarrow i_{l+1}$ , we have  $w_X(i_l, i_{l+1}) \leq \mathbf{r}_{i_{l+1}}/\mathbf{r}_{i_l}$ . Therefore:  $\prod_{l=1}^k w_X(i_l, i_{l+1}) \leq \prod_{l=1}^k \frac{\mathbf{r}_{i_{l+1}}}{\mathbf{r}_{i_l}} = 1$ . Thus, the product of weights along any cycle is at most 1.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.9.** *Given an allocation  $X$  and let  $\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_n$  be a feasible solution to LP(4). Then, for every agent  $i$  we have  $\mathfrak{R}_i(X) \leq \mathbf{r}_i$ .*

**Proof.** Consider  $G_X$  and let  $i_1 \rightarrow i_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow i_k$  be the rankpath of agent  $i$ . For each edge  $i_l \rightarrow i_{l+1}$ , we have  $\mathbf{r}_{i_l} w_X(i_l, i_{l+1}) \leq \mathbf{r}_{i_{l+1}}$ . Furthermore since this path is the rankpath of agent  $i$  we have  $\mathfrak{R}_{i_l}(X) w_X(i_l, i_{l+1}) = \mathfrak{R}_{i_{l+1}}(X)$  and  $\mathfrak{R}_{i_1}(X) = 1$ . Therefore we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{R}_i(X) &= \prod_{l=1}^{k-1} w_X(i_l, i_{l+1}) & w_X(i_l, i_{l+1}) &= \mathfrak{R}_{i_{l+1}}(X)/\mathfrak{R}_{i_l}(X) \\ &\leq \prod_{l=1}^{k-1} \mathbf{r}_{i_{l+1}}/\mathbf{r}_{i_l} & w_X(i_l, i_{l+1}) &\leq \mathbf{r}_{i_{l+1}}/\mathbf{r}_{i_l} \\ &= \mathbf{r}_{i_k}/\mathbf{r}_{i_1} \leq \mathbf{r}_i. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Indeed, Lemmas 2.9 and 2.8 together establish that if LP(4) is feasible for allocation  $X$ , then the weighted envy graph  $G_X$  contains no cycle with a weight product exceeding one. Moreover, the solution to this LP corresponds precisely to the ranks of the agents. Specifically, for the restricted additive valuations, a straightforward condition on the allocation ensures the feasibility of LP (4).

**Lemma 2.10.** *Suppose that the set of valuations is restricted additive, and let  $X$  be an allocation. If for each agent  $i$ ,  $\chi_i[i] = \chi_i$ , the product of weights along any cycle in  $G_X$  is at most 1.*

**Proof.** Let  $i_1 \rightarrow i_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow i_k \rightarrow i_{k+1} = i_1$  be a cycle in  $G_X$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{l=1}^k w_X(i_l, i_{l+1}) &= \frac{v_{i_1}(X_{i_2})}{v_{i_1}(X_{i_1})} \cdot \frac{v_{i_2}(X_{i_3})}{v_{i_2}(X_{i_2})} \cdot \dots \cdot \frac{v_{i_k}(X_{i_1})}{v_{i_k}(X_{i_k})} \\ &\leq \frac{v_{i_1}(X_{i_2})}{v_{i_2}(X_{i_2})} \cdot \frac{v_{i_2}(X_{i_3})}{v_{i_3}(X_{i_3})} \cdot \dots \cdot \frac{v_{i_k}(X_{i_1})}{v_{i_1}(X_{i_1})} \\ &= \frac{v_{i_1}(X_{i_2})}{v(X_{i_2})} \cdot \frac{v_{i_2}(X_{i_3})}{v(X_{i_3})} \cdot \dots \cdot \frac{v_{i_k}(X_{i_1})}{v(X_{i_1})} \\ &\leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

In this paper, we use  $G_{\beta, X}$  to refer to a specific subgraph of  $G_X$  that comprises all the vertices but includes only the edges with weight more than  $\beta$ . In Sections 5, 6, and 8 we respectively use  $G_{1, X}$ ,  $G_{\sqrt{2}, X}$ , and  $G_{0, X}$  as our base graphs. Here we highlighting a structural properties of  $G_{\beta, X}$  in Lemmas 2.11.

**Lemma 2.11.** *Consider restricted additive valuations, and let  $X$  be a  $1/\beta$ -EFX allocation for some  $\beta \in [1, +\infty)$ . For every edge  $i \rightarrow j$  in  $G_{\beta, X}$ , it follows that  $v_i(X_j) = v(X_j)$ .*




Figure 1: An example of valuations that are both restricted additive and  $(2, 2)$ -bounded

**Proof.** Edge  $i \rightarrow j$  in  $G_{\beta, X}$  implies  $\beta v_i(X_i) < v_i(X_j)$ . Therefore, if there's a good  $g$  with value 0 to agent  $i$  in  $X_j$ , we have  $\beta v_i(X_i) < v_i(X_j \setminus \{g\})$ , which is in contradiction with the  $1/\beta$ -EFX property of  $X$ .  $\square$

**Observation 2.1.** Give an allocation  $X$  and an agent  $i$ . Let  $P$  be the rank path agent  $i$ . Then for every edge  $j \rightarrow k \in P$  we have:  $\mathfrak{R}_j(X)w(j, k) = \mathfrak{R}_k(X)$ .

**Example 1.** Consider an instance with 4 agents and 7 goods. The (additive) values of the agents for these goods are shown in Figure 1. This set of valuation functions is restricted additive with the following inherent values:  $v_{g_1} = v_{g_2} = 3$ ,  $v_{g_3} = v_{g_4} = 6$ ,  $v_{g_5} = 7$ , and  $v_{g_6} = v_{g_7} = 10$ . In addition, this set of valuation functions is  $(2, 2)$ -bounded, meaning that each good is relevant to at most two agents, and each pair of agents has at most two relevant goods. Indeed, agents 1 and 3 are the only agents with two common relevant goods, and every other pair of agents has at most one common relevant good. So if we remove  $g_1$ , the instance becomes  $(2, 1)$ -bounded. Now, consider the allocation depicted in Figure 2. In this allocation, we have  $X_0 = \{g_5\}$ ,  $X_1 = \{g_1, g_3\}$ ,  $X_2 = \{g_6\}$ ,  $X_3 = \{g_2, g_4\}$ ,  $X_4 = \{g_7\}$ , and values are  $v(X_1) = 9$ ,  $v(X_2) = 10$ ,  $v(X_3) = 9$ ,  $v(X_4) = 10$ . Here, for every agent  $i$  we have  $v_i(X_i) = v(X_i)$  which means that no good with value 0 is allocated to any agent. In Figure 2 you can find graphs  $G_X$ ,  $G_{0, X}$ ,  $G_{1, X}$  and  $G_{0.6, X}$ . As you can see  $G_{0, X}$ ,  $G_{0.5, X}$  and  $G_{1, X}$  are subgraph of  $G_X$  containing only edges with value respectively more than 0, 0.5 and 1. Now, consider  $G_{0, X}$ . This graph contains multiple paths that lead to vertex 4, such as  $p_1 = 3 \rightarrow 4$  and  $p_2 = 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4$ . The product of the edge weights in path  $p_1$  is  $10/9$ , while the product of the edge weights in path  $p_2$  is  $20/27$ . By comparing the products of weights of different paths leading to vertex 4, we can see that path  $p_1$  has the highest product of weights. Therefore,  $\mathfrak{R}_4(X) = 10/9$  and  $\mathbf{v}_4(X) = 9$ .

**Example 2.** In the instance depicted in Figure 3, there are four agents with additive valuations and three goods. The value of good  $g_1$  varies across agents, indicating that the valuations are not restricted additive. Since good  $g_1$  is relevant to three agents, we have  $p = 3$ . Moreover, for each pair of goods, there is at most one agent that is relevant to both of them. Therefore, the set of valuation functions is  $(3, 1)$ -bounded. The hypergraph corresponding to this set of valuation functions is depicted in Figure 3.

**Remark 2.12.** The allocation shown in Example 1 can serve as an evidence illustrating that the EFX with charity allocation algorithm proposed by Akrami et al. [3] might terminate before allocating the whole set of goods. To establish the algorithm's termination, they introduce a potential function  $\phi(\cdot)$  and demonstrate that, with each update, the potential function increases. This particular allocation achieves the maximum value of  $\phi$  among all possible allocations. Consequently, any modification to this allocation decreases the value of  $\phi$ . However, the allocation is not complete.




Figure 2: An allocation, and envy graphs  $G_X, G_{0,X}, G_{0.5,X}, G_{1,X}$




Figure 3: Example of  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded valuations



---

**Algorithm 1:** General Framework for Allocation Algorithms

---

```
1 Function Allocate( $\chi_0$ ):
2    $\chi \leftarrow$  Basic Feasible Allocation;
3   while there exists an applicable update rule do
4     // The number of rules is  $k$ 
5     for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $k$  do
6       if Rule  $i$  is applicable on  $\chi$  then
7         Apply Rule  $i$  to  $\chi$  to obtain  $\chi'$ ;
8          $\chi \leftarrow \chi'$ ;
9         break;
10      end
11    end
12  Execute final step on  $\chi$  to obtain  $\chi^*$ ;
13  return  $\chi^*$ ;
```

---

## 2.1 A General Framework of Our Allocation Algorithms

Although we present algorithms with different guarantees for various valuation functions, all proposed algorithms adhere to a unified framework. To avoid repetition, we describe this general framework in this section.

The algorithms presented in this paper consist of a set of updating rules. We will refer to these rules by their indices. For instance, if an algorithm has  $k$  updating rules, we will denote them as Rule 1, Rule 2, ..., and Rule  $k$ . Each rule comprises a set of preconditions that determine its applicability and a set of updates that define how the allocation is modified. All algorithms are initiated with a basic feasible allocation and, at each step, select and apply the rule with the lowest index that is applicable. Thus, if Rule  $k$  is applied, none of the first  $k - 1$  rules were applicable.

We also define several properties and ensure that these properties are maintained after each update rule is applied. Additionally, we show that these properties hold for basic feasible allocations.

For each algorithm, we define a potential function  $\phi$  and show that its value increases after each update rule is applied. With a known upper bound on the value of this function, we are guaranteed that the algorithm will eventually reach a state where no more updates can be made. At this point, we perform a final step and return the resulting allocation. We then demonstrate that this final allocation satisfies the desired fairness notion.

Algorithm 1 shows the pseudocode of our general framework. For convenience, we use  $\chi$  and  $\chi'$  to refer to our allocation before and after each update, respectively. Also, we denote the final allocation with  $\chi^*$ .

## 3 Results Overview

We prove a set of fairness guarantees for the restricted additive and  $(p, q)$ -bounded valuation functions. These results, alongside previously known results for the restricted additive and  $(p, q)$ -bounded valuations form a symmetrical pattern:

- Akrami *et al.* show that for  $(\infty, \infty)$ -bounded valuations with the restricted additive property we can always find a complete EF2X allocation, and furthermore, a partial EFX allocation

	Monotone	Restricted additive
(2,1)-bounded		EFX [27] ♦
(2,∞)-bounded	Open	EFX (Theorem 8.8) ♦
(∞,1)-bounded		EF2X (Theorem 5.7) ♣ $\langle \text{EFX}, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1 \rangle$ (Theorem 5.6) ♣ $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ -EFX (Theorem 7.8*) ♥
(∞,∞)-bounded	Open	EF2X [3] ♣ $\langle \text{EFX}, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1 \rangle$ [3] ♣ $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ -EFX (Theorem 6.4) ♥

Table 1: Overview of the results. To highlight the symmetry of the results for two valuations, we use symbols ♣, ♦, ♠, ♥. Results with the same label are symmetric. Note that for Theorem 7.8, we also have a subadditivity assumption.

with less than  $n/2$  discarded goods [3]. Here, we show that the same guarantees hold for  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded valuations (Theorems 5.6 and 5.7).

- Christodoulou show that for  $(2, 1)$ -bounded valuations we can always find a complete EFX allocation. [27]. Here, we prove the same guarantee for  $(2, \infty)$ -bounded valuation with the restricted additive property (Theorem 8.8).
- We show that both  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded valuations, and  $(\infty, \infty)$ -bounded valuations with the restricted additive property admit a  $(\sqrt{2}/2)$ -EFX allocation (Theorems 6.4 and 7.8).

In our algorithms across different sections, we use various subgraphs of the weighted envy graph, including  $G_{0,X}$ ,  $G_{1,X}$ , and  $G_{\sqrt{2},X}$ . For all these algorithms, it is crucial to ensure that  $G_X$  does not contain a cycle with a total product of weights strictly greater than 1. For the restricted additive valuations, a simple property guarantees this condition. As shown in Lemma 2.10, if we allocate only relevant goods to each (non-source) agent, then  $G_X$  does not have such cycles. For  $(p, q)$ -bounded valuations, we perform our update rules in a way that keeps LP (4) feasible. This ensures that  $G_X$  remains free of cycles with a weight product greater than 1.

As a warmup, in Section 5 we show that every family of  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded valuation functions admit EFX allocations with less than  $n/2$  discarded goods. Next, we further extend this allocation and obtain a complete EF2X allocation. These two results complement the guarantees of Akrami *et al.* [3] for the restricted additive setting. Hence, most of the updating rules we use in our allocation algorithms resemble those in Akrami *et al.* [3]. However, the structure of  $(p, q)$ -bounded valuations and using virtual values allow us to utilize a much simpler potential function to prove the termination of our algorithms. We show that after each update, the pair containing social welfare and the number of allocated goods increases.

An essential part of the algorithm proposed by Akrami *et al.* is an elegant process called envy-elimination. In the envy-elimination process, they eliminate all possible strong envies from the allocation while ensuring that the potential function either remains unchanged or increases. Surprisingly, in the envy-elimination process they only remove goods from the bundles, however, with carefully defining the potential function, we can show that we never fall into infinite loop trap. The reason that here our potential function is much simpler is that, here we don't use envy-elimination in our algorithm. Instead, we need to make sure that after each update the allocation guarantees EFX, since we cannot resolve strong envies via envy-elimination.

The idea of the envy-elimination process makes the restricted additive process a great starting point for deriving more general results on EFX: for the restricted additive valuations, we don't have to be concerned about the EFX guarantee after each update, because we can use envy-elimination to restore this property. This, allows for a handful of different updates. Here, we employ a refined version of the envy-elimination process and obtain a  $(\sqrt{2}/2)$ -EFX allocation for the restricted additive valuations. Our allocation algorithm features two simple update rules, an envy-elimination process, and a final step.

Interestingly, we achieve the same guarantee for  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded valuations using a simple algorithm. This algorithm consists of only one updating rule! and a final step. It heavily relies on concepts such as rank and virtual value. Since the algorithm does not involve envy-elimination, its potential function is straightforward: we show that after each update, the Nash social welfare of the allocation increases.

The existence of symmetric results for these two valuation functions inspired us to explore the possibility of obtaining similar outcomes as Christodoulou *et al.* [27] for the case that the valuations are restricted additive and  $p = 2$ . We affirmatively address this question. In Section 8, we present an algorithm that achieves an EFX allocation for the case of restricted additive valuations with  $p = 2$ . This algorithm includes four updating rules and a final step. The concepts of rank and virtual value are also essential for this algorithm. Similar to our previous algorithm, here we utilize the Nash social welfare as the potential function.

### 3.1 Future Directions

Several intriguing directions emerge for further exploration following this work. One key area of interest is whether the observed symmetry between restricted additive valuations and  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded valuations extends to other problem domains. Notably, there are significant results for the maximin fairness notion and restricted additive valuations, commonly referred to as the Santa Claus problem [6, 7, 10, 29]. Investigating whether analogous results can be achieved for the Santa Claus problem with  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded valuations would be of great interest.

Furthermore, it is worthwhile to consider the generalization of our  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$  algorithms to more general settings, such as additive and subadditive valuations. One can think of using the concept of rank and virtual value to potentially achieve a  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ -EFX allocation in the additive setting.

## 4 Related Work

The history of cake-cutting and fair allocation is deeply rooted, encompassing many diverse studies. These investigations span various fairness notions, such as proportionality, envy-freeness, equity, maximin-share, EF1, EFX, and many more. For an extensive overview of fair division problems, we recommend referring to [42] and [17]. Additionally, recent surveys by Aziz *et al.* [8] and Amanatidis *et al.* [4] provide valuable insights into the fair allocation of indivisible goods.

This paper centers on the EFX notion, initially introduced by Caragiannis [22] and somewhat earlier by Gourves *et al.* [35]. Since its introduction, EFX has been the subject of extensive studies on the fair allocation in recent years. As highlighted earlier, the existence or non-existence of EFX allocations across general settings remains an open question. Studies related to this notion can be classified into distinct categories which we mention in the following. Our results in this paper intersect with all of these categories.

**Finding EFX allocations.** Given the inherent complexity of EFX, the guarantees naturally pertain to specific cases. Classic results include the existence of EFX allocations for 2 agents with general monotone valuations, and 3 agents with additive valuations [23, 41]. In the case of 3 agents, the guarantee is extended to the cases where the valuations of two agents are monotone, and the value of the third agent is MMS-feasible [2]. Christodoulou [27] establishes the existence of EFX allocations for  $(p, q)$ -bounded valuations when  $p = 2$  and  $q = 1$ .

**Finding approximate EFX allocations.** Finding approximately fair allocations is a common approach for various fairness notions, including EFX. Plaut and Roughgarden [41] were the first to prove an approximation guarantee of  $1/2$ -EFX for EFX allocations. Later, Amanatidis *et al.* [5] improved this factor to  $\phi - 1$ -EFX. Recently, Barman *et al.* [11] have explored the existence of approximate EFX allocations. They introduce a parameter  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$  to bound the multiplicative range of nonzero values for goods across agents, and develop an algorithm that yields a  $\frac{2\gamma}{\sqrt{5+4\gamma}-1}$ -EFX allocation.

**Relaxing EFX.** Other studies explore relaxed variations of the EFX notion to achieve improved guarantees. For example, Farhadi *et al.* [33] investigate a scenario where, instead of removing the least valuable good, a random good is removed from the bundle. They establish the existence of a 0.74 approximation guarantee for this modified notion. As mentioned earlier, Akrami *et al.* [3] show that in the case of restricted additive valuations, an EF2X allocation can be guaranteed. Caragiannis *et al.* also [19] introduce and establish the existence of epistemic EFX, where for every agent  $i$ , there exists a way to shuffle the goods of other agents such that agent  $i$  does not envy any other agent up to any good. Another example is envy-freeness up to one less preferred good, introduced by Barman *et al.* [14], which imposes a limit on the value of the eliminated good.

**EFX with Charity.** Finally, a strand of research has delved into the exploration of partial EFX allocations rather than complete ones. Naturally, we want to keep the number of discarded goods as small as possible. The pioneering work in this area was a partial EFX allocation, with the Nash welfare at least half of the optimal Nash welfare [20]. Subsequently, Chaudhury *et al.* [25] prove the existence of a partial EFX allocation that leaves at most  $n - 1$  goods unallocated. Berger *et al.* [14] reduced the number of discarded goods to  $n - 2$ . Chaudhury *et al.* [24] presented a general framework for achieving a partial  $(1 - \epsilon)$ -EFX allocations with a sub-linear number of unallocated goods for any  $\epsilon$ . The number of unallocated goods in this framework is then successively reduced to ultimately  $O_\epsilon(\sqrt{n \log n})$  [1, 13, 37].

## 5 Warmup: A Partial EFX and a Complete EF2X Allocation for $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded Valuations

We start by proposing an algorithm that returns an EF2X allocation for  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded valuations. The algorithm involves four updating rules, followed by a final step. We show that if none of the rules is feasible, the allocation is EFX with at most  $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1$  number of discarded goods. Next, we show that after running the final step, the output is a complete EF2X allocation. The majority of our updating rules are similar to those of Akrami *et al.* [3] for the restricted additive valuations. We design the rules such that the following potential function increases after each update:

$$\phi(\chi) = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n v_i(\chi_i), \sum_{i=1}^n |\chi_i| \right].$$

Indeed, after each update, either the social welfare increases, or the social welfare remains unchanged while the number of allocated items increases. Our potential function is simpler compared to the one proposed by Akrami *et al.* [3], primarily due to the absence of the envy-elimination process in our algorithm. In addition, we guarantee that after each update, the allocation remains EFX, and furthermore, the following property holds:

‡ (i) For each **non-source** agent  $i$  in  $G_{1,\chi}$ ,  $\chi_i[i] = \chi_i$ .

One can easily check that the basic feasible allocation satisfies Property ‡ (i). Note that, the underlying assumption of Property ‡ (i) is that  $G_{1,\chi}$  is acyclic. To maintain this property, after each update, we remove any envy-cycle in  $G_{1,\chi}$  by rotating the bundles through that cycle. Formally, after each update, while there is a cycle  $C$  in  $G_{1,\chi}$ , we reallocate the bundles in  $C$  as follows: for each edge  $i \rightarrow j \in C$ , we allocate  $\chi_j[i]$  to agent  $i$  and return  $\chi_j \setminus \chi_j[i]$  back to the pool. Trivially, resolving the envy-cycles increases the potential function, and does not violate Property ‡ (i). For convenience, we ensure that after each update, we resolve all envy-cycles. In the following sections we describe our updating rules and their properties. We designate our algorithm in this section as CXXRA.

## 5.1 Update Rule 1

Rule 1 is feasible when there is an agent  $i$  and a good  $g \in \chi_0$  such that  $v_i(\{g\}) > v_i(\chi_i)$ . In such cases, we allocate  $g$  to agent  $i$  and return the goods in  $\chi_i$  back to the pool. Next, we resolve all the cycles in  $G_{1,\chi}$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $\chi$  be an EFX allocation satisfying Property ‡ (i), and let  $\chi'$  be the allocation after applying Rule 1 on  $\chi$ . Then  $\chi'$  is EFX and satisfies Property ‡ (i). Furthermore, we have  $\phi(\chi') > \phi(\chi)$ .*

**Proof.** The update exclusively impacts the bundle of agent  $i$ . Given that  $v_i(\chi'_i) > v_i(\chi_i)$ , agent  $i$  does not strongly envy any other agent in  $\chi'$ . Furthermore, as  $|\chi'_i| = 1$ , no other agent strongly envies agent  $i$ . Consequently,  $\chi'$  is EFX. To prove the validity of Property ‡ (i), it suffices to show that all goods in  $\chi'_i$  are relevant to agent  $i$ , which is indeed the case since  $\chi'_i = g$  and the  $g$  is relevant to agent  $i$ . Therefore, Property ‡ (i) holds. Also, this update increases social welfare and therefore, after the update we have  $\phi(\chi') > \phi(\chi)$ .  $\square$

## 5.2 Update Rule 2

The properties of  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded valuations are pivotal for this updating rule. This rule is feasible when an agent  $i$  and a good  $g \in \chi_0$  meet the following conditions: agent  $i$  is a source in  $G_{1,\chi}$ , and  $g$  is relevant to agent  $i$ . If so, we allocate  $g$  to agent  $i$  and return the goods in  $\chi_i$  that are irrelevant to agent  $i$  back to the pool. In other words, we set  $\chi'_i = (\chi_i \cup \{g\})[i]$ . Next, we resolve envy-cycles.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $\chi$  be an EFX allocation satisfying Property ‡ (i). Assume that Rule 1 is not applicable on  $\chi$ , and let  $\chi'$  be the allocation after applying Rule 2 on  $\chi$ . Then  $\chi'$  is EFX and satisfies Property ‡ (i). Furthermore, we have  $\phi(\chi') > \phi(\chi)$ .*

**Proof.** The bundle of agent  $i$  is the only bundle that has been affected, and we have that  $v_i(\chi'_i) > v_i(\chi_i)$ . Therefore, we only need to prove that no other agent  $j$  envies agent  $i$ . Note that since  $i$  has no incoming edge in  $G_{1,\chi}$ , agent  $j$  does not envy any single good in  $\chi_i$ . Furthermore, since Rule 1

is not applicable, agent  $j$  does not envy good  $g$ . In addition, since all the goods in  $\chi'_i$  are relevant to agent  $i$  and the valuations are  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded, at most one good in  $\chi'_i$  is relevant to  $j$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} v_j(\chi'_j) &= v_j(\chi_j) & \chi'_j &= \chi_j \\ &\geq \max_{g' \in \chi'_i} v_j(\{g'\}) & j &\text{ does not envy any good in } \chi'_i \\ &= v_j(\chi'_i) & \text{valuations are } &(\infty, 1)\text{-bounded.} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the resulting allocation is EFX. Also, since all the goods in the bundle of agent  $i$  are relevant to her, Property  $\ddagger$  (i) holds. Also, this update increases social welfare and therefore, after the update we have  $\phi(\chi') > \phi(\chi)$ .  $\square$

### 5.3 Update Rule 3

This rule is feasible when there exist an agent  $i$  and a good  $g \in \chi_0$  such that  $i$  is a source in  $G_{1,\chi}$  and there is no other agent  $j$  such that  $v_j(\chi_j) < v_j(\chi_i \cup \{g\})$ . In that case, we allocate good  $g$  to agent  $i$ . Next, we resolve all the cycles in  $G_{1,\chi}$ .

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $\chi$  be an EFX allocation satisfying Property  $\ddagger$  (i). Assume that Rule 1 and Rule 2 are not applicable on  $\chi$ , and let  $\chi'$  be the allocation after applying Rule 3 on  $\chi$ . Then  $\chi'$  is EFX and satisfies Property  $\ddagger$  (i). Furthermore, we have  $\phi(\chi') > \phi(\chi)$ .*

**Proof.** According to preconditions of this update rule, after allocating good  $g$  to agent  $i$ , no other agent envies her, which means allocation  $\chi'$  is EFX. In addition, agent  $i$  remain a source and does not violate Property  $\ddagger$  (i). Furthermore, since Update Rule 2 is not applicable, good  $g$  is irrelevant to agent  $i$ . Therefore, the social welfare of the agents remains unchanged after this allocation, while the total number of allocated goods increases. As a result, we have  $\phi(\chi') > \phi(\chi)$ .  $\square$

### 5.4 Update Rule 4

To describe our last updating rule, we need first to define the concept of the most envious agent. Suppose we have an allocation  $X$ , let  $S$  be a set of goods, and suppose there are one or more agents who envy  $S$ . We can identify the minimal subset of  $S$ , referred to as  $S'$ , which is envied by at least one agent, namely  $i$ . Consequently, if we allocate the set  $S'$  to agent  $i$ , the value of her bundle increases. Furthermore, no other agent strongly envies agent  $i$  since there is no agent who envies a strict subset of  $S'$ . We call agent  $i$ , the most envious agent of set  $S$ . Note that there might be multiple options as the most envious agent for a set  $S$ .

Denote the sources of  $G_{1,\chi}$  by  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k$ , and define  $\mathcal{C}_{\chi, s_i}$  as the set of agents that can be reached from  $s_i$  via a directed path in  $G_{1,\chi}$ , but cannot be reached from any of the preceding sources  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{i-1}$ . Note that  $\sum_{i=1}^k |\mathcal{C}_{\chi}(s_i)| = n$ .

The fourth updating rule applies when the first three rules are not applicable, and there are  $l \geq 1$  distinct goods  $g_0, g_1, \dots, g_{l-1}$  in  $\chi_0$ ,  $l$  distinct sources  $s'_0, s'_1, \dots, s'_{l-1}$ , and  $l$  distinct agents  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_l$  such that  $t_i \notin \mathcal{C}_{\chi}(s'_i)$  and  $t_{i+1}$  is the most envious agent of  $\chi_{s'_i} \cup \{g_i\}$  for  $0 \leq i < l$ . Then we shift the bundles of agents through cycle  $s'_0, \dots, t_1, s'_1, \dots, t_2, s'_2, \dots, t_l, s'_0$ , i.e, we set:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi'_{t_{i+1}} &\leftarrow \text{The smallest subset of } \chi_{s'_i} \cup \{g_i\} \text{ which is envied by } t_{i+1}. \\ \chi'_i &\leftarrow \chi_j \text{ For every edge } i \rightarrow j \text{ in the cycle.} \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $\chi$  be an EFX allocation satisfying Property  $\dagger(i)$ . Assume that Rule 1, Rule 2, and Rule 3 are not applicable on  $\chi$ , and let  $\chi'$  be the allocation after applying Rule 4 on  $\chi$ . Then  $\chi'$  is EFX and satisfies Property  $\dagger(i)$ . Furthermore, we have  $\phi(\chi') > \phi(\chi)$ .*

**Proof.** For each non-source agent  $i$  in  $G_{1,\chi'}$  we need to prove  $\chi'_i = \chi'_i[i]$ . By the way we shift the bundles through the cycle, for every agent in the cycle, the statement trivially holds. For every  $j \notin C$ , we know that the bundle of this agent has not changed. Also, any agent  $i \notin C$  that was a source prior to the update, remains a source thereafter. Hence, Property  $\dagger(i)$  holds after the update. In addition, after this update, no agent is worse-off. Moreover agents in the cycle are strictly better-off. Therefore,  $\phi(\chi') > \phi(\chi)$ .  $\square$

We also prove Lemma 5.5 on the applicability of Rule 4. We later use this lemma to prove an upper bound on the number of remaining goods, when none of Rules 1 – 4 are applicable.

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $\chi$  be an EFX allocation satisfying Property  $\dagger(i)$ . Assume that Rule 1, Rule 2, and Rule 3 are not applicable on  $\chi$ . Let  $s'_1, s'_2, \dots, s'_l$  be subset of sources of  $G_{1,\chi}$  such that for every  $1 \leq i \leq l$ ,  $|\mathcal{C}_\chi(s'_i)| \geq 2$ . If  $\chi_0$  contains at least  $l$  goods, then Rule 4 is always applicable.*

**Proof.** Assume  $g_1, g_2, \dots, g_l$  are  $l$  goods in  $\chi_0$ . For each good  $g_i$ , let  $t_i$  be the most envious agent of the set of goods  $\chi_{s'_i} \cup \{g_i\}$ . We construct a new graph with  $l$  vertices, where each vertex represents one of the sources. For each  $1 \leq i \leq l$ , we add a directed edge from  $s'_i$  to the source  $s'_j$  where  $t_i \in s'_j$ . Therefore, the new graph has  $l$  vertices and every vertex has exactly one outgoing edge. Hence, this graph admits a cycle which corresponds to a situation satisfying the conditions of Rule 4.  $\square$

## 5.5 Final Step

As we mentioned earlier, when none of the updating rules are applicable, we head to a final step to finalize the allocation. However, before describing our final step, we show that when none of the rules 1 – 4 are feasible, we are guaranteed that  $|\chi_0| < \frac{n}{2}$ , which means that  $\chi$  is an EFX allocation with less than  $\frac{n}{2}$  number of discarded goods.

**Theorem 5.6.** *For every instance with  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded valuations, there exists an EFX allocation which discards no more than  $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1$  goods.*

**Proof.** By Lemma 5.5, when none of Rules 1-4 is applicable, the number of remaining goods in the pool is strictly less than the number of sources whose component contains at least 2 agents. Given that  $\sum_{i=1}^k |\mathcal{C}_\chi(s_i)| = n$ , there are at most  $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$  such sources. Consequently, the number of remaining goods in the pool is at most  $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1$ .  $\square$

The purpose of the final step is to allocate all the remaining goods in the pool and achieve a complete EF2X allocation. Let  $g_1, g_2, \dots, g_x$  denote the remaining goods in the pool, and let  $s'_1, s'_2, \dots, s'_y$  be the sources with at least 2 agents in their components. Since Rule 4 is not applicable, by Lemma 5.5 we have  $x < y$ . In the final step, for every  $1 \leq i \leq x$ , we allocate  $g_i$  to an arbitrary non-source agent in  $\mathcal{C}_\chi(s'_i)$ .

**Theorem 5.7.** *Suppose the valuations are  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded and let  $\chi^*$  be the allocation returned by CXXRA. Then,  $\chi^*$  is EF2X.*

**Proof.** Let  $\chi$  be the allocation before the final step. By Theorem 5.6 we know that  $\chi$  is EFX. Let  $j$  be an agent that receives a good in the final step. We claim that before the final step,  $|\chi_j| = 1$ . To show this, note that since  $j$  is not a source, before the final step, some agent  $i$  envies  $\chi_j$ . However,

since the allocation is EFX, agent  $i$  does not envy any strict subset of  $\chi_j$ , which means  $\chi_j[i] = \chi_j$ . However, by definition of  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded valuations, there can be at most one good with a non-zero value to both agents  $i$  and  $j$ . Hence,  $|\chi_j| = 1$ . Consequently, the size of  $\chi_j^*$  after the final step will be 2. Therefore, the allocation is envy-free up to any two goods.  $\square$

## 6 $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ -EFX for Restricted Additive Valuations

In this section, we present a  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ -EFX allocation algorithm for the case that the set of valuations is restricted additive. The algorithm consists of two updating rules and a final step. After each update, we use an envy elimination process to ensure the allocation remains  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ -EFX. Each one of the updating rules, the envy elimination process, and the final step takes an allocation as input and returns another allocation as output. Our algorithm ensures that, in all steps before the final step, Property §(i) holds. This property trivially holds for the basic feasible allocation.

§(i): For every agent  $i$ ,  $\chi_i[i] = \chi_i$ .

Given Lemma 2.10, Property §(i) implies that  $G_{\sqrt{2}, \chi}$  is always acyclic.<sup>2</sup> We assume that  $G_{\sqrt{2}, \chi}$  contains  $k$  source agents. For convenience, we also assume that the agents are re-indexed after each update so that agents  $1, 2, \dots, k$  are the sources of  $G_{\sqrt{2}, \chi}$ , and  $v(\chi_1) \leq v(\chi_2) \leq \dots \leq v(\chi_k)$ . We define our potential function as  $\phi(\chi) = [v(\chi_1), v(\chi_2), \dots, v(\chi_k), \infty]$ . We designate our algorithm in this section as  $C\sqrt{2}XRA$ .

### 6.1 Envy Elimination

As we mentioned before, the envy elimination process is initially introduced by Akrami *et al.* [3]. This process aims to eliminate strong envies among agents while preserving essential allocation properties. Here, we propose a simple alternative for the envy elimination process: Given an allocation  $\chi$  with potential strong envies, as long as there exist two agents,  $i$  and  $j$ , where agent  $i$   $\sqrt{2}$ -strongly envies agent  $j$ , we identify a good  $g \in \chi_j$  such that  $\sqrt{2}v_i(\chi_i) < v_i(\chi_j \setminus \{g\})$ , and transfer  $g$  from  $\chi_j$  to  $\chi_0$ .

The envy elimination process turns out to be very useful. Given the nature of the process, we know that the resulting allocation is  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ -EFX. Interestingly, as we show in Lemma 6.1, this process also guarantees that the value of the potential function does not decrease.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $\chi$  be a  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ -EFX allocation satisfying Property §(i), and let  $\chi'$  be the allocation after applying envy elimination. Then,  $\chi'$  satisfies Property §(i). Furthermore we have  $\phi(\chi) \leq \phi(\chi')$ .*

**Proof.** By definition of the process, Property §(i) trivially holds. To show that  $\phi(\chi) \leq \phi(\chi')$ , note that the envy elimination process may involve multiple updates. We show that after each update, the value of  $\phi$  does not decrease. Consider an allocation  $\chi$  where, for some agents  $i$  and  $j$ , we have  $\sqrt{2}v_i(\chi_i) < v_i(\chi_j/g)$ . Let  $\chi''$  be the allocation after the update, which means  $\chi''$  is identical to  $\chi$  except that good  $g$  is transferred from the bundle of agent  $j$  to the pool. Note that agent  $j$  is neither a source before the update nor becomes a source after, since agent  $i$   $\sqrt{2}$ -envies agent  $j$  both before and after the process. The only change in the source nodes happens when agent  $j$  starts to  $\sqrt{2}$ -envy some source node after the process. Therefore, the set of sources in  $G_\chi$  is a subset of the set of sources  $G_{\chi''}$ . Therefore, by definition of  $\phi(\cdot)$ , we have  $\phi(\chi) \leq \phi(\chi'')$ , and consequently,  $\phi(\chi) \leq \phi(\chi')$ .  $\square$

---

<sup>2</sup>Note that this also holds for the initial allocation.



## 6.2 Update Rule 1

The first rule takes an allocation  $\chi$  as input, and if there exists a source agent  $i$  and a good  $g \in \chi_0$  such that good  $g$  is relevant to agent  $i$ , we allocate  $g$  to agent  $i$ .

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $\chi$  be an allocation satisfying Property §(i), and let  $\chi'$  be the allocation after applying Rule 1. Then  $\chi'$  satisfies Property §(i). Furthermore, we have  $\phi(\chi) < \phi(\chi')$ .*

**Proof.** The only agent whose value for her bundle is changed is agent  $i$ , and the allocated good  $g$  is relevant to agent  $i$ . Therefore, Property §(i) hold. Furthermore,  $v(\chi'_i) > v(\chi_i)$  and by Lemma A.1 we have  $\phi(\chi) < \phi(\chi')$ .  $\square$

## 6.3 Update Rule 2

In the second updating rule, if for some agent  $i$ ,  $v_i(\chi_i) < \sqrt{2}v_i(\chi_0)$ , we update the allocation as follows: since Rule 1 is not applicable,  $i$  is not a source. Also, since  $G_{\sqrt{2},\chi}$  is acyclic, there is a source, let's say  $j$ , with a directed path to  $i$  in  $G_{\sqrt{2},\chi}$ . We shift the allocation through this path, i.e., for every edge  $i_1 \rightarrow i_2$  in this path, we allocate  $\chi_{i_2}$  to agent  $i_1$ . We also give all the goods that are valuable to agent  $i$  in  $\chi_0$  to  $i$ , and return the goods in  $\chi_i$  back to the pool.

**Lemma 6.3.** *Let  $\chi$  be an allocation satisfying Property §(i). Assume that Rule 1 is not applicable, and let  $\chi'$  be the allocation after applying Rule 2. Then,  $\chi'$  satisfies Property §(i). Furthermore, we have  $\phi(\chi) < \phi(\chi')$ .*

**Proof.** Given that agent  $i$  selects only relevant goods from the pool, we have  $v_i(\chi'_i) = v(\chi'_i)$ . Furthermore, according to Lemma 2.11, for every edge  $i_1 \rightarrow i_2$  in the path from  $j$  to  $i$ , we have  $v_{i_1}(\chi'_{i_2}) = v(\chi'_{i_2})$ . Consequently, Property §(i) remains valid after the update. To prove  $\phi(\chi) < \phi(\chi')$ , we utilize Lemma A.1. Considering  $A, x, x'$  in the statement of Lemma A.1 we proceed with:

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \text{Agents in the path from } j \text{ to } i \\ x &= \min_{i' \in A} (v(\chi_{i'})) = v(\chi_j) \\ x' &= \min_{i' \in A} (v(\chi'_{i'})) \end{aligned}$$

Also, since for agent  $i$ ,  $v(\chi_j) < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}v(\chi_i) < v(\chi'_i)$ , and for every other agent  $k \in A$ ,  $v(\chi_j) < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}v(\chi_k)$ , we have  $x < x'$ . Finally, agent  $j$  is a source in  $G_{\sqrt{2},\chi}$  and therefore,  $x = v(\chi_j)$ . Thus, all conditions of Lemma A.1 are satisfied, which implies  $\phi(\chi) < \phi(\chi')$ .  $\square$

## 6.4 Final Step

When none of Rules 1 and 2 is feasible, we give the entire pool to agent 1 and terminate the allocation. In Theorem 6.4 we show that the resulting allocation is  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ -EFX.

**Theorem 6.4.** *Suppose that the valuations are restricted additive, and let  $\chi^*$  be the allocation returned by  $C\sqrt{2}XRA$ . Then,  $\chi^*$  is a  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ -EFX allocation.*

**Proof.** Let  $\chi$  be the allocation before the final step. First, note that agent 1 is a source in  $G_\chi$ . We prove that after this allocation, no-one will  $\sqrt{2}$ -envy  $\chi_1^*$ . As a contradiction, suppose agent  $i$   $\sqrt{2}$ -envies agent 1. Since agent 1 was a source, agent  $i$  did not  $\sqrt{2}$ -envy him before the final step.

This means that the pool has a non-zero value for agent  $i$ , and given the fact that Rule 1 was not applicable, agent  $i$  is not a source. Now, suppose that agent  $j$  is a source that has a path to  $i$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
v_i(\chi_1^*) &= v(\chi_1) + v_i(\chi_0) \\
&\leq v(\chi_i) + v_i(\chi_0) && v(\chi_1) \leq v(\chi_i) \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}v(\chi_j) + v_i(\chi_0) && j \text{ has a path to } i \text{ in } G_{\sqrt{2},\chi} \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}v(\chi_j) + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}v(\chi_j) && j \text{ does not } \sqrt{2}\text{-envy } \chi_0 \\
&\leq \sqrt{2}v(\chi_j).
\end{aligned}$$

But this contradicts the fact that agent  $i$  does not  $\sqrt{2}$ -envy agent  $j$  before the final step.  $\square$

## 7 $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ -EFX for $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded Valuations

In this section, we propose a  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ -EFX allocation algorithm for agents with  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded valuations. Our algorithm consists of a single updating rule, followed by a final step. Throughout the algorithm, we use the Nash social welfare of the allocation as our potential function, that is,  $\phi(\chi) = \text{NSW}(\chi)$ . We also ensure that the following properties are always maintained throughout the algorithm before the final step:

- †(i) LP (4) is feasible for allocation  $\chi$ .
- †(ii) No agent **virtually strongly envies** another agent. Formally, for any pair of agents  $i$  and  $j$ , and any good  $g \in \chi_j$ , we have:  $\mathbf{v}_i(\chi) \geq v_i(\chi_j \setminus g)$ .
- †(iii) For every agent  $i$ ,  $\chi_i[i] = \chi_i$ .

We designate our algorithm in this section as  $\text{C}\sqrt{2}\text{XPQ}$ .

### 7.1 Update Rule 1

This update rule is applicable when an agent virtually envies the pool. Let  $\hat{\chi}_0 \subseteq \chi_0$  denote a minimal subset of the pool that is virtually envied by at least one agent. Consider agent  $i$  with the maximum value of  $v_i(\hat{\chi}_0)/\mathbf{v}_i(\chi)$ . Note that, all goods in  $\hat{\chi}_0$  are relevant to agent  $i$ . Let  $P$  denote the rankpath of agent  $i$ . In this update rule, we allocate  $\hat{\chi}_0$  to agent  $i$ , and shift the bundles along path  $P$ . Formally, for every edge  $j \rightarrow k \in P$  we allocate  $\chi_k$  to agent  $j$ . Then, we return the bundle of the first agent of  $P$  to the pool. This update rule does not rely on properties of  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded valuations and can be used in the general setting.

To prove that  $\chi'$  satisfies the required properties, we define  $\mathbf{r}_j$  for each agent  $j$  as follows:

$$\mathbf{r}_j = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{R}_j(\chi), & \text{if } j \notin P \\ \mathfrak{R}_k(\chi), & \text{if } j \rightarrow k \in P \\ \frac{v_j(\chi_0^*)}{\mathbf{v}_j(\chi)}, & \text{if } j = i \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

We now show that  $\mathbf{r}$  is a feasible solution to LP (4) for allocation  $\chi'$ .

**Lemma 7.1.** *Let  $\chi$  be an allocation satisfying Properties  $\dagger(i)$  and  $\dagger(ii)$ , and let  $\chi'$  be the allocation after applying Rule 1. Then, for every agent  $j$ ,  $\frac{v_j(\chi'_j)}{\tau_j} = \mathbf{v}_j(\chi)$ .*

**Proof.** We distinguish three cases:

**Case 1** ( $j \notin P$ ): We have both  $\tau_j = \mathfrak{R}_i(\chi)$  and  $\chi'_j = \chi_j$ . This implies:

$$\mathbf{v}_j(\chi) = \frac{v_j(\chi_j)}{\mathfrak{R}_i(\chi)} = \frac{v_j(\chi'_j)}{\tau_j}$$

**Case 2** ( $j \rightarrow k \in P$ ): After shifting the bundles through  $P$ , agent  $j$  receives the bundle of agent  $k$ . Furthermore since  $P$  is the rankpath of agent  $i$ , by Observation 2.1 we have  $\mathfrak{R}_k(\chi) = \mathfrak{R}_j(\chi) \frac{v_j(\chi_k)}{v_j(\chi_j)}$ . Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{v_j(\chi'_j)}{\tau_j} &= \frac{v_j(\chi_k)}{\mathfrak{R}_k(\chi)} && \chi'_j = \chi_k \text{ and } \tau_j = \mathfrak{R}_k(\chi) \\ &= \frac{v_j(\chi_j)}{\mathfrak{R}_j(\chi)} = \mathbf{v}_j(\chi) && \text{Observation 2.1.} \end{aligned}$$

**Case 3** ( $j = i$ ): Since  $\chi'_i = \hat{\chi}_0$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{v_i(\chi'_i)}{\tau_i} &= \frac{v_i(\hat{\chi}_0)}{\tau_i} && \chi'_i = \hat{\chi}_0 \\ &= \frac{v_i(\hat{\chi}_0)}{\frac{v_i(\hat{\chi}_0)}{\mathbf{v}_i(\chi)}} = \mathbf{v}_i(\chi) && \tau_i = \frac{v_i(\hat{\chi}_0)}{\mathbf{v}_i(\chi)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 7.2.** *Let  $\chi$  be an allocation satisfying Properties  $\dagger(i)$  and  $\dagger(ii)$ , and let  $\chi'$  be the allocation after applying Rule 1. Then,  $\tau$  is a feasible solution to LP (4) for allocation  $\chi'$ .*

**Proof.** In order to show that for every agents  $j$  and  $k$ ,  $\tau_j w_{\chi'}(j, k) \leq \tau_k$ , we distinguish three cases:

**Case 1** ( $k \notin P$ ): The bundle of agent  $k$  remains the same as before. Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_j w_{\chi'}(j, k) &= \frac{\tau_j}{v_j(\chi'_j)} v_j(\chi'_k) && \text{Definition 2.3} \\ &= \frac{v_j(\chi'_k)}{\mathbf{v}_j(\chi)} && \text{Lemma 7.1} \\ &= \frac{v_j(\chi_k)}{\mathbf{v}_j(\chi)} && \chi'_k = \chi_k \\ &= \mathfrak{R}_j(\chi) \frac{v_j(\chi_k)}{v_j(\chi_j)} && \text{Definition 2.7} \\ &\leq \mathfrak{R}_k(\chi) && \text{Property } \dagger(i) \\ &= \tau_k. && (5) \end{aligned}$$

**Case 2** ( $k \rightarrow l \in P$ ): Agent  $k$  receives the bundle of agent  $l$ . Additionally, by Equation (5) we have  $\tau_k = \mathfrak{R}_l(\chi)$ . Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_j w_{\chi'}(j, k) &= \frac{\tau_j}{v_j(\chi'_j)} v_j(\chi'_k) && \text{Definition 2.3} \\
&= \frac{v_j(\chi'_k)}{\mathbf{v}_j(\chi)} && \text{Lemma 7.1} \\
&= \frac{v_j(\chi_l)}{\mathbf{v}_j(\chi)} && \chi'_k = \chi_l \\
&= \mathfrak{R}_j(\chi) \frac{v_j(\chi_l)}{v_j(\chi_j)} && \text{Definition 2.7} \\
&\leq \mathfrak{R}_l(\chi) && \chi \text{ satisfies Property } \dagger(i) \\
&= \tau_k && \text{Equation (5)}.
\end{aligned}$$

**Case 3** ( $k = i$ ): Agent  $i$  receives bundle  $\hat{\chi}_0$ . Note that since  $i$  has the maximum value of  $\frac{v_i(\hat{\chi}_0)}{\mathbf{v}_i(\chi)}$  we have  $\frac{v_j(\hat{\chi}_0)}{\mathbf{v}_j(\chi)} \leq \frac{v_i(\hat{\chi}_0)}{\mathbf{v}_i(\chi)}$ . This implies:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_j w_{\chi'}(j, i) &= \frac{\tau_j}{v_j(\chi'_j)} v_j(\chi'_i) && \text{Definition 2.3} \\
&= \frac{v_j(\chi'_i)}{\mathbf{v}_j(\chi)} && \text{Lemma 7.1} \\
&= \frac{v_j(\hat{\chi}_0)}{\mathbf{v}_j(\chi)} && \chi'_i = \hat{\chi}_0 \\
&\leq \frac{v_i(\hat{\chi}_0)}{\mathbf{v}_i(\chi)} && \frac{v_i(\hat{\chi}_0)}{\mathbf{v}_i(\chi)} \text{ is maximum} \\
&= \tau_i && \text{Equation (5)}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 7.3.** *Let  $\chi$  be an allocation satisfying Properties  $\dagger(i)$  and  $\dagger(ii)$ , and let  $\chi'$  be the allocation after applying Rule 1. Then for every agent  $i$  we have  $\mathbf{v}_j(\chi) \leq \mathbf{v}_j(\chi')$ .*

**Proof.** Lemma 7.2 ensures that for every agents  $j$  and  $k$  we have  $\tau_j w_{\chi'}(j, k) \leq \tau_k$ . According to Lemma 2.8, this guarantees  $G_{\chi'}$  does not have any cycle whose total product of the edge weights is strictly greater than 1. Additionally, by Lemma 2.9 for each agent  $j$  we have  $\mathfrak{R}_j(\chi') \leq \tau_j$  and Lemma 7.1 implies that  $\mathbf{v}_j(\chi) = \frac{v_j(\chi'_j)}{\tau_j}$ . Consequently, we have  $\mathbf{v}_j(\chi') = \frac{v_j(\chi'_j)}{\mathfrak{R}_j(\chi')} \geq \frac{v_j(\chi'_j)}{\tau_j} = \mathbf{v}_j(\chi)$ . □

**Lemma 7.4.** *Let  $\chi$  be an allocation satisfying Properties  $\dagger(i)$  and  $\dagger(ii)$ , and let  $\chi'$  be the allocation after applying Rule 1. Then, for every agents  $j$  and  $k$  and good  $g \in \chi'_k$ , we have  $\mathbf{v}_j(\chi') \geq v_j(\chi'_k \setminus \{g\})$ .*

**Proof.** We show that every agent  $j$  does not virtual strongly envy another agent  $k$ . If  $k \neq i$ , there exist a (not necessarily different from  $k$ ) agent  $l$  such that  $\chi'_k = \chi_l$ . Therefore for every good  $g \in \chi'_k = \chi_l$  we have:

$$\mathbf{v}_j(\chi') \geq \mathbf{v}_j(\chi) \qquad \text{Lemma 7.3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq v_j(\chi_l \setminus \{g\}) && \chi \text{ satisfies Property } \dagger(\text{ii}) \\
&= v_j(\chi'_k \setminus \{g\}) && \chi'_k = \chi_l.
\end{aligned}$$

Additionally, for agent  $i$  we know that  $i$  receives  $\hat{\chi}_0$ , which is a minimal subset that is virtually envied by at least one agent. Hence  $j$  does not virtually strongly envy agent  $i$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 7.5.** *Let  $\chi$  be an allocation satisfying Properties  $\dagger(i)$  and  $\dagger(ii)$  and  $\dagger(iii)$ , and let  $\chi'$  be the allocation after applying Rule 1. Then, for every agent  $j$ ,  $\chi'_j[j] = \chi'_j$ .*

**Proof.** If  $j \notin P$ , since  $\chi'_j = \chi_j$ , the property trivially holds. Additionally since  $\hat{\chi}_0$  is a minimal all the goods in  $\chi'_i$  are relevant to agent  $i$ . Now, we only need to show that for every agent  $j \rightarrow k \in P$  all the goods in  $\chi'_j = \chi_k$  are relevant to  $j$ . Assume by contradiction that there exist a good  $g \in \chi_k = \chi'_j$  that is not relevant to agent  $j$ . Then, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
v_j(\chi_k \setminus \{g\}) &= v_j(\chi_k) && g \text{ is not relevant to } j \\
&= v_j(\chi_j)w_\chi(j, k) && \text{Definition 2.3} \\
&= v_j(\chi_j)\frac{\mathfrak{R}_k(\chi)}{\mathfrak{R}_j(\chi)} && \text{Observation 2.1} \\
&= \mathbf{v}_j(\chi)\mathfrak{R}_k(\chi) && \text{Definition 2.7} \\
&> \mathbf{v}_j(\chi) && \mathfrak{R}_k(\chi) > 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $j$  virtually strongly envies  $k$  in allocation  $\chi$ . This contradicts the fact that  $\chi$  satisfies Property  $\dagger(\text{ii})$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 7.6** (of Lemmas 7.2, 7.4 and 7.5). *Let  $\chi$  be an allocation satisfying Properties  $\dagger(i)$  and  $\dagger(ii)$  and  $\dagger(iii)$ , and let  $\chi'$  be the allocation after applying Rule 1. Then, for every agent  $j$ ,  $\chi'_j[j] = \chi'_j$ .*

**Lemma 7.7.** *Let  $\chi$  be an allocation satisfying Properties  $\dagger(i)$  and  $\dagger(ii)$ , and let  $\chi'$  be the allocation after applying Rule 1. Then,  $\text{NSW}(\chi') > \text{NSW}(\chi)$ .*

**Proof.** Since the bundle of agents that are not in  $P$  is still the same as before, it is sufficient to show that the product of valuation of agents in path  $P$  increases.

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{j \in P} v_j(\chi'_j) &= v_i(\hat{\chi}_0) \prod_{j \rightarrow k \in P} v_j(\chi_k) && \text{Bundles are shifted through path } P \\
&> \mathbf{v}_i(\chi) \prod_{j \rightarrow k \in P} v_j(\chi_k) && v_i(\hat{\chi}_0) > \mathbf{v}_i(\chi) \\
&= \frac{v_i(\chi_i)}{\mathfrak{R}_i(\chi)} \prod_{j \rightarrow k \in P} v_j(\chi_k) && \text{Definition 2.7} \\
&= \frac{v_i(\chi_i)}{\mathfrak{R}_i(\chi)} \prod_{j \rightarrow k \in P} v_j(\chi_j)w_\chi(j, k) && \text{Definition 2.3} \\
&= \frac{\mathfrak{R}_i(\chi)}{\mathfrak{R}_i(\chi)} \prod_{j \in P} v_j(\chi_j) && P \text{ is rankpath of } i \\
&= \prod_{j \in P} v_j(\chi_j).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $\text{NSW}(\chi') > \text{NSW}(\chi)$ .  $\square$

In conclusion, after applying this update rule the resulting allocation is virtually EFX, virtual values of agents do not decrease and Nash social welfare of the allocation strictly increases.

## 7.2 Final Step

When Rule 1 not applicable, we perform a final step to achieve a complete  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ -EFX allocation. Let  $i$  be an agent with rank equal to one in  $\chi$ , and  $S$  be the set of all other agents whose rank is at most  $\sqrt{2}$ . In the final step, first we iterate through  $S$  in an arbitrary order and ask each agent to pick all the goods in the pool that are relevant to her, then we allocate all the remaining goods in the pool to agent  $i$  and return the allocation.

**Theorem 7.8.** *Suppose that the valuations are restricted additive, and let  $\chi^*$  be the allocation returned by  $C\sqrt{2}XPQ$ . Then,  $\chi^*$  is a  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ -EFX allocation.*

**Proof.** First we show that for every agents  $j \in S$  and  $k \in N$ , agent  $k$  does not  $\sqrt{2}$ -envy agent  $j$ . Note that since  $\chi_k \subseteq \chi_k^*$  we have  $v_k(\chi_k) \leq v_k(\chi_k^*)$ . Additionally, since agent  $j$  only receives the goods from the pool that are relevant to her and the valuations are  $(\infty, 1)$ -bounded, at most one good in  $\chi_j^*$  is relevant to agent  $k$ . We denote this good as  $g$ . If  $g \in \chi_0$ , since Rule 1 is not applicable  $v_k(\chi_k) \geq v_k(\chi) \leq v_k(g)$  and  $k$  does not envy agent  $j$ ; otherwise  $g \in \chi_j$  and since  $\mathfrak{R}_j(\chi) \leq \sqrt{2}$  agent  $k$  does not  $\sqrt{2}$ -envy  $\chi_j$ . Hence, agent  $k$  does not  $\sqrt{2}$ -envy  $j$ .

Now, we need to prove that there is no agent  $k \in N$  who  $\sqrt{2}$ -envies  $\chi_i^*$ . In the case that  $k \in S$ , since  $k$  has picked all the goods from the pool which are relevant to her, agent  $i$  does not receive any good that is relevant to agent  $k$ . Furthermore, since  $\mathfrak{R}_i(\chi) = 1$ , agent  $k$  does not envy agent  $i$ . For the case that  $\mathfrak{R}_k(\chi) > \sqrt{2}$ , since Rule 1 is not applicable we have  $v_k(\chi_0) < v_k(\chi) \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}v_k(\chi_k)$ . Additionally, since  $\chi$  satisfies Property  $\dagger(\text{i})$  we have  $\mathfrak{R}_k(\chi)w_\chi(k, i) \leq \mathfrak{R}_i(\chi)$ , and since  $\mathfrak{R}_i(\chi) = 1$  and  $\mathfrak{R}_k(\chi) > \sqrt{2}$  we have  $v_k(\chi_i) \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}v_k(\chi_k)$ . Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}
v_k(\chi_i^*) &\leq v_k(\chi_i \cup \chi_0) && \chi_i^* \subseteq \chi_i \cup \chi_0 \\
&\leq v_k(\chi_i) + v_k(\chi_0) && \text{Subadditivity} \\
&\leq v_k(\chi_i) + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}v_k(\chi_k) && \text{Rule 1 is not applicable} \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}v_k(\chi_k) + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}v_k(\chi_k) && \mathfrak{R}_i(\chi) = 1 \\
&= \sqrt{2}v_k(\chi_k)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, there is no agent  $k$  that  $\sqrt{2}$ -envies agent  $i$ .

It only remains to prove that for every agents  $j$  and  $k$  such that  $\mathfrak{R}_k > \sqrt{2}$ , agent  $j$  does not strongly-envy agent  $k$ . Note that  $\chi$  satisfies Property  $\dagger(\text{ii})$ , which means for every good  $g \in \chi_k$  we have  $v_j(\chi) \geq v_j(\chi_k \setminus \{g\})$ . Additionally, since  $\mathfrak{R}_k(\chi) > \sqrt{2}$ ,  $k$  does not receive any good in the final step, i.e.,  $\chi_k^* = \chi_k$ . Therefore  $v_j(\chi_j^*) \geq v_j(\chi) \geq v_j(\chi_k \setminus \{g\})$  and agent  $j$  does not strongly envy agent  $k$ .

In conclusion, after the final step, there is no agent who  $\sqrt{2}$ -envies an agent  $j$  such that  $\mathfrak{R}_j(\chi) \leq \sqrt{2}$  and there is no agent who strongly envies an agent  $k$  such that  $\mathfrak{R}_k(\chi) > \sqrt{2}$ .  $\square$

## 8 EFX for Restricted Additive Valuations with $p = 2$

Our last algorithm finds a complete EFX allocation for the case that the set of valuations is  $(2, \infty)$ -bounded and restricted additive. With  $p = 2$ , each good is relevant to a maximum of 2 agents, while any pair of agents may share multiple relevant goods.

Our algorithm consists of four updating rules and a final step. Unlike our previous algorithms, agents may become satisfied and be eliminated from the process. Therefore, here  $N$  refers to the set of remaining agents. We also define rank, rankpath, and virtual value based on the allocation of the remaining agents. We utilize the following potential function to prove the termination of our algorithm:

$$\phi(\chi) = (n - |N|, \text{NSW}(\chi)).$$

Therefore, after each update, either the number of satisfied agents increases or the Nash social welfare of the allocation increases. We designate our algorithm in this section as PQRAX. Furthermore, our updates are designed in a way that the following properties are always satisfied during the algorithm:

- ↑(i) For every agent  $i \in N$ , there is some agent  $j$  such that  $\chi_i \subseteq M[i, j]$ . We call agent  $j$ , the corresponding agent of agent  $i$ . Note that the corresponding agent of  $i$  can be  $i$  itself.
- ↑(ii) For every agent  $i, j \in N$ , and every  $g \in \chi_j$  we have  $v_i(\chi_j \setminus g) \leq v_i(\chi)$ .

Note that Properties ↑(i) and ↑(ii) trivially hold for the basic feasible allocation.

**Observation 8.1.** *Let  $X$  be an allocation that satisfies Property ↑(i). Then for every  $i, j \in N$  such that  $\chi_j \subseteq M[i, j]$ , we have  $v_i(\chi_j) = v(\chi_j)$ .*

**Observation 8.2.** *Let  $X$  be an allocation that satisfies Property ↑(i). Then for every  $i \in N$ , we have  $v_i(X) = v(X_{\text{root}(i, X)})$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $i_1 \rightarrow i_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow i_k \rightarrow i$  be the rankpath of agent  $i$  in  $G_X$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{R}_i(X) &= w_X(i_1, i_2) \times w_X(i_2, i_3) \times \dots \times w_X(i_k, i) && \text{Definition 2.3,} \\ &= \frac{v_{i_1}(X_{i_2})}{v_{i_1}(X_{i_1})} \times \frac{v_{i_2}(X_{i_3})}{v_{i_2}(X_{i_2})} \times \dots \times \frac{v_{i_k}(X_i)}{v_{i_k}(X_{i_k})} \\ &= \frac{v(X_{i_2})}{v(X_{i_1})} \times \frac{v(X_{i_3})}{v(X_{i_2})} \times \dots \times \frac{v(X_i)}{v(X_{i_k})} && \text{Observation 8.1,} \\ &= \frac{v(X_i)}{v(X_{i_1})}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Therefore } v_i(X) = \frac{v(X_i)}{\mathfrak{R}_i(X_i)} = v(X_i) \frac{v(X_{i_1})}{v(X_i)} = v(X_{i_1}) = v(X_{\text{root}(i, X)}). \quad \square$$

### Update Rule 1

The first updating rule is applicable when an agent  $i \in N$  with  $\mathfrak{R}_i(X) = 1$  and a good  $g \in \chi_0$  exists such that  $g$  has the same type as the goods in  $\chi_i$ . Formally, assuming  $\chi_i \subseteq M[i, j]$  for some  $j$ , then  $g$  also belongs to  $M[i, j]$ . If these conditions are met, we replace  $\chi_i$  with a minimal subset of  $\chi_i \cup \{g\}$  that has a value greater than  $v(\chi_i)$ .

**Observation 8.3.** Let  $\chi'$  be the result of applying Rule 1 on  $\chi$ . Then all edges of  $G_{0,\chi}$  are same as the edges of  $G_{0,\chi'}$ .

**Lemma 8.1.** Let  $\chi$  be an allocation satisfying Properties  $\uparrow(i)$  and  $\uparrow(ii)$ , and let  $\chi'$  be the result of applying Rule 1 on  $\chi$ . Then,  $\chi'$  satisfies Properties  $\uparrow(i)$  and  $\uparrow(ii)$ . Furthermore, we have  $\phi(\chi) < \phi(\chi')$  and for every remaining agent  $k$  we have  $\mathbf{v}_k(\chi) \leq \mathbf{v}_k(\chi')$ .

**Proof.** Given that  $\chi'_i \subseteq M[i, j]$  and the other bundles remain unchanged,  $\chi'$  satisfies Property  $\uparrow(i)$ . We prove that  $\chi'$  satisfies Property  $\uparrow(ii)$ . This implies that for every remaining agent  $k$  and  $g \in \chi'_k$ , we have  $v(\chi'_k \setminus \{g\}) \leq \mathbf{v}_k(\chi')$ . There are two cases  $k = i$  and  $k \neq i$ . Let  $k \neq i$  and a good  $g \in \chi'_k$  and  $r = \text{root}(k, \chi')$ . We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
v(\chi'_k \setminus \{g\}) &= v(\chi_k \setminus \{g\}) && (k \neq i), \\
&\leq \mathbf{v}_k(\chi) && \chi \text{ satisfies Property } \uparrow(ii), \\
&\leq v(\chi_r) && \text{Observation 8.3,} \\
&\leq v(\chi'_r) \\
&= \mathbf{v}_k(\chi') && \text{Observation 8.2.}
\end{aligned}$$

Now let  $k = i$  and a good  $g \in \chi'_i$  and  $r = \text{root}(i, \chi')$ . We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
v(\chi'_i \setminus \{g\}) &\leq v(\chi_i) && (\chi'_i \text{ is minimal}), \\
&\leq v(\chi_r) && (\mathfrak{R}_i(\chi) = 1), \\
&\leq v(\chi'_r) \\
&= \mathbf{v}_i(\chi') && \text{Observation 8.2.}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\chi'$  satisfies both Properties  $\uparrow(i)$  and  $\uparrow(ii)$ .

Since  $v(\chi_i) < v(\chi'_i)$ , and all other bundles remain unchanged, we have  $\phi(\chi) < \phi(\chi')$ .

In order to show that for every agent  $k$  we have  $\mathbf{v}_k(\chi) \leq \mathbf{v}_k(\chi')$ , let  $r = \text{root}(k, \chi')$ . We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{v}_k(\chi) &\leq v(\chi_r) && \text{Observation 8.3,} \\
&\leq v(\chi'_r) \\
&= \mathbf{v}_k(\chi') && \text{Observation 8.2.}
\end{aligned}$$

□

## Update Rule 2

This rule is applicable if there exists an agent  $i \in N$  such that for some  $j$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_i(\chi) < v(\chi_0[i, j])$ . If so, we update the allocation as follows: let  $j$  be the agent with the minimum virtual value such that  $\mathbf{v}_i(\chi) < v(\chi_0[i, j])$ , and let  $P = i_1 \rightarrow i_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow i_k \rightarrow i$  be the rankpath of agent  $i$ . We allocate a minimal subset of  $\chi_0[i, j]$  with value more than  $\mathbf{v}_i(\chi)$  to agent  $i$ , shift the bundles through  $P$ , and return  $\chi_{i_1}$  back to the pool  $\chi_0$ .



**Lemma 8.2.** *Let  $\chi$  an allocation satisfying Properties  $\uparrow(i)$  and  $\uparrow(ii)$ , and let  $\chi'$  be the result of applying Rule 2 on  $\chi$ . Then,  $\chi'$  satisfies Properties  $\uparrow(i)$  and  $\uparrow(ii)$ . Furthermore, we have  $\phi(\chi) < \phi(\chi')$  and for every remaining agent  $k$  we have  $\mathbf{v}_k(\chi) \leq \mathbf{v}_k(\chi')$ .*

**Proof.** During the update, only the bundle of agent  $i$  is modified.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, Property  $\uparrow(i)$  remains valid for agents other than  $i$ . For agent  $i$  we also know that  $\chi'_i \subseteq M[i, j]$ . Therefore, Property  $\uparrow(i)$  holds for  $\chi'$ .

To show that Property  $\uparrow(ii)$  holds after the update, we note that this update rule is indeed exactly the same as Rule 1 in Section 7. Therefore, by Lemma 7.3 we conclude that virtual values do not decrease after the update. Furthermore, by Lemma 7.4,  $\chi'$  satisfies Property  $\uparrow(ii)$ , and by Lemma 7.7 we have  $\phi(\chi) < \phi(\chi')$ . □

### Update Rule 3

The third updating rule is applicable when there is an agent  $i \in N$  such that for every agent  $j \in N$ ,  $v_i(\chi_j) = 0$ . If so, we ask agent  $i$  to pick either  $\chi_i$  or  $\chi_0[i]$  that is more valuable to him and return the other bundle back to the pool. Also, we mark agent  $i$  as satisfied and remove her from the process.

**Lemma 8.3.** *Let  $\chi$  an allocation satisfying Properties  $\uparrow(i)$  and  $\uparrow(ii)$ , and let  $\chi'$  be the result of applying Rule 3 on  $\chi$ . Then,  $\chi'$  satisfies Properties  $\uparrow(i)$  and  $\uparrow(ii)$ . Furthermore, we have  $\phi(\chi) < \phi(\chi')$  and for every remaining agent  $k$  we have  $\mathbf{v}_k(\chi) \leq \mathbf{v}_k(\chi')$ .*

**Proof.** According to Rule 3, for every remaining agent  $j$ , we have  $v_i(\chi_j) = 0$ , meaning agent  $i$  isn't in agent  $j$ 's rankpath. Thus,  $\mathbf{v}_j(\chi) = \mathbf{v}_j(\chi')$ . Also, the update keeps all the remaining agents' bundles unchanged. Thus,  $\chi'$  satisfies Properties  $\uparrow(i)$  and  $\uparrow(ii)$ . Finally, since  $|N|$  decreases, we have  $\phi(\chi) < \phi(\chi')$ . □

**Lemma 8.4.** *Let  $i$  be an agent satisfied by Rule 3. Then,  $i$  will never strongly envy any remaining agent, and no remaining agent will ever strongly envy agent  $i$ .*

**Proof.** After the update, we have  $v_i(\chi'_0) \leq v_i(\chi_i^*)$ , and for every remaining agent  $j$ ,  $v_i(\chi'_j) = 0$ . Therefore,  $v_i(\cup \chi') \leq v_i(\chi_i^*)$  which means that agent  $i$  will not envy any remaining agent in subsequent steps. Furthermore, considering Property  $\uparrow(i)$  for  $\chi$ , there exists an agent  $j$  such that  $\chi_i \subseteq M[i, j]$ . The only agent who might strongly envy  $i$  is agent  $j$ . Post-update,  $\chi'_i$  can either be  $\chi_i$  or  $\chi_0[i]$ .

If  $\chi'_i = \chi_i$ , let  $g \in \chi'_i$ , and let  $\chi^*$  denote the final allocation. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
v(\chi'_i \setminus g) &= v(\chi_i \setminus g) && \text{since } \chi'_i = \chi_i, \\
&\leq \mathbf{v}_i(\chi) && \text{by Property } \uparrow(ii) \text{ of } \chi, \\
&\leq \mathbf{v}_j(\chi) && \text{due to } j \rightarrow i, \\
&\leq \mathbf{v}_j(\chi^*) && \text{virtual values do not decrease,} \\
&\leq v(\chi_j^*).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, agent  $j$  does not strongly envy  $i$  in the final allocation.

---

<sup>3</sup>While other bundles may be transferred among agents, none is modified.

Now, if  $\chi_i^l = \chi_0[i]$ , for any remaining agent  $j \in N^l$  in the final allocation  $\chi^*$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
v_j(\chi_i^l) &= v(\chi_0[i, j]) && \text{since } \chi_i^l = \chi_0[i], \\
&\leq \mathbf{v}_j(\chi) && \text{since Rule 2 does not apply to } \chi, \\
&\leq \mathbf{v}_j(\chi^*) && \text{virtual values do not decrease,} \\
&\leq v(\chi_j^*).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, agent  $j$  does not strongly envy  $i$  in the final allocation.  $\square$

## Update Rule 4

Before describing this rule, we prove that when the first three rules are not applicable, then  $G_{\chi,0}$  exhibits a special structure.

**Lemma 8.5.** *Let  $\chi$  be an allocation satisfying Properties  $\uparrow(i)$  and  $\uparrow(ii)$ . If the first three rules are not applicable, then  $G_{0,\chi}$  consists of one or several disjoint cycles.*

**Proof.** Since  $\chi$  satisfies Property  $\uparrow(i)$ , the in-degree of each vertex in  $G_{0,\chi}$  is equal to 1. Additionally since Rule 3 is not applicable to  $\chi$ , the out-degree of each vertex is at least 1. Therefore  $G_{0,\chi}$  consists of one or more cycles.  $\square$

In the fourth updating rule, we select and satisfy one agent with rank 1. Let  $i$  be an agent with  $\mathfrak{R}_i(\chi) = 1$  and suppose  $i \rightarrow j_1 \rightarrow j_2 \dots \rightarrow j_k \rightarrow i$  be the cycle in  $G_{\chi,0}$  containing  $i$ . We ask agent  $i$  to pick either  $\chi_i \cup \chi_0[i]$  or  $\chi_{j_1}$ , whichever that is more valuable to her. We then mark agent  $i$  as satisfied and remove her from the process. Finally, if agent  $i$  picked  $\chi_{j_1}$ , we shift the bundles through the cycle, i.e., for every  $2 \leq \ell < k$ , we give  $\chi_{\ell+1}$  to agent  $j_\ell$  and give  $\chi_i$  to agent  $j_k$ .

**Lemma 8.6.** *Let  $\chi$  be an allocation satisfying Properties  $\uparrow(i)$  and  $\uparrow(ii)$  and let  $\chi^l$  be the result of applying Rule 4 on  $\chi$ . Then,  $\chi^l$  satisfies Properties  $\uparrow(i)$  and  $\uparrow(ii)$ . Furthermore, we have  $\phi(\chi) < \phi(\chi^l)$  and for every remaining agent  $k$  we have  $\mathbf{v}_k(\chi) \leq \mathbf{v}_k(\chi^l)$ .*

**Proof.** First we show that the virtual value of each remaining agent does not decrease after the update. By Observation 8.2, the virtual value of each agent in a cycle, is equal to the minimum value of bundles in that cycle. Therefore we have  $\mathbf{v}_i(\chi) = \mathbf{v}_{j_1}(\chi) = \mathbf{v}_{j_2}(\chi) = \dots = \mathbf{v}_{j_k}(\chi) = v(\chi_i)$ . Now let  $r^l = \text{root}(k, \chi^l)$  and let  $l$  be the agent such that  $\chi_{r^l}^l = \chi_l$ . For every remaining agent  $j$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{v}_j(\chi) &= \mathbf{v}_i(\chi) && , \\
&= v(\chi_i) && \mathfrak{R}_i(\chi) = 1, \\
&\leq v(\chi_l) && \chi_i \text{ is the bundle with minimum value in the cycle,} \\
&= v(\chi_{r^l}^l) && \chi_{r^l}^l = \chi_l, \\
&= \mathbf{v}_j(\chi^l) && \text{root}(k, \chi^l) = r^l.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the virtual values of the remaining agents do not decrease.

Since the set of bundles in  $\chi^l$  remains unchanged,  $\chi^l$  satisfies Property  $\uparrow(i)$ . To Prove that  $\chi^l$  satisfies Property  $\uparrow(ii)$ , let  $j$  be the remaining agent and  $g \in \chi_j^l$  and  $\chi^l j = \chi_k$ . We have:

$$v(\chi_j^l \setminus \{g\}) = v(\chi_k \setminus \{g\}) \qquad \chi^l j = \chi_k,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbf{v}_k(\chi) && \chi \text{ satisfies Property } \uparrow(\text{ii}), \\
&= \mathbf{v}_j(\chi) && \text{all virtual values are } v(\chi_i), \\
&\leq \mathbf{v}_j(\chi').
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $\chi'$  satisfies both Properties  $\uparrow(\text{i})$  and  $\uparrow(\text{ii})$ .

Since  $|N'| = |N| - 1$ , we have  $\phi(\chi) < \phi(\chi')$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 8.7.** *Let  $i$  be an agent satisfied by Rule 4. Then,  $i$  will never strongly envy any remaining agent, and no remaining agent will ever strongly envy agent  $i$ .*

**Proof.** Since only  $\chi_0, \chi_i, \chi_{j_1}$  may be relevant to agent  $i$ , and this agent picks the more valuable bundle between  $\chi_i \cup \chi_0[i]$  and  $\chi_{j_1}$ , it doesn't matter what happens in the future, and  $i$  will not envy any bundle in  $\chi^*$ .

Suppose that  $j$  is the corresponding agent of agent  $i$ . There are two cases for  $\chi_i^*$ . The first case is  $\chi_i' = \chi_i \cup \chi_0[i]$ . In this case for agent  $k \neq j$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
v_k(\chi_i^*) &= \chi_0[i, k] && \chi_i \subseteq M[i, j], \\
&\leq \mathbf{v}_k(\chi) && \text{Rule 2 is not applicable on } \chi, \\
&\leq \mathbf{v}_k(\chi^*) && \text{virtual values does not decrease,} \\
&\leq v_k(\chi_k^*).
\end{aligned}$$

and for agent  $j$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
v_j(\chi_i^*) &= v(\chi_i[i, j]) && \text{Rule 1 is not applicable on } \chi, \\
&= v(\chi_i) && \chi_i \subseteq M[i, j], \\
&= \mathbf{v}_j(\chi) && \mathfrak{R}_i(\chi) = 1, \\
&\leq \mathbf{v}_j(\chi^*) && \text{virtual values does not decrease,} \\
&\leq v_j(\chi_j^*).
\end{aligned}$$

The second case is  $\chi_i' = \chi_{j_1}$ . In this case only  $j_1$  may envy  $i$ . Let  $g \in \chi_{j_1}$ . We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
v(\chi_i^* \setminus \{g\}) &= v(\chi_{j_1} \setminus \{g\}) && \chi_i^* = \chi_{j_1}, \\
&\leq \mathbf{v}_{j_1}(\chi) && \chi \text{ satisfies Property } \uparrow(\text{ii}), \\
&\leq \mathbf{v}_{j_1}(\chi^*) && \text{virtual values does not decrease,} \\
&\leq v_{j_1}(\chi_{j_1}^*).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore no agent in  $\chi^*$  will strongly envy  $i$ .  $\square$

## Final Step

Finally, if only one agent is left behind, i.e.,  $|N| = 1$ , we allocate the whole set of items in  $\chi_0$  to the remaining agent and return the allocation.

**Theorem 8.8.** *Suppose that the valuations are restricted additive and  $(2, \infty)$ -bounded, and let  $\chi^*$  be the allocation returned by PQRAX. Then,  $\chi^*$  is a EFX allocation.*

**Proof.** In this algorithm, we satisfy all agents one by one. By Lemmas 8.4 and 8.7, the returned allocation by PQRAX is EFX. □

## References

- [1] H. Akrami, N. Alon, B. R. Chaudhury, J. Garg, K. Mehlhorn, and R. Mehta. Efx allocations: Simplifications and improvements. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.07638*, 2022.
- [2] H. Akrami, N. Alon, B. R. Chaudhury, J. Garg, K. Mehlhorn, and R. Mehta. Efx: a simpler approach and an (almost) optimal guarantee via rainbow cycle number. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 61–61, 2023.
- [3] H. Akrami, R. Rezvan, and M. Seddighin. An ef2x allocation protocol for restricted additive valuations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.13676*, 2022.
- [4] G. Amanatidis, G. Birmpas, A. Filos-Ratsikas, and A. A. Voudouris. Fair division of indivisible goods: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.07551*, 2022.
- [5] G. Amanatidis, E. Markakis, and A. Ntokos. Multiple birds with one stone: Beating  $1/2$  for efx and gmms via envy cycle elimination. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 841:94–109, 2020.
- [6] C. Annamalai, C. Kalaitzis, and O. Svensson. Combinatorial algorithm for restricted max-min fair allocation. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 13(3):1–28, 2017.
- [7] A. Asadpour, U. Feige, and A. Saberi. Santa claus meets hypergraph matchings. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 8(3):1–9, 2012.
- [8] H. Aziz, B. Li, H. Moulin, and X. Wu. Algorithmic fair allocation of indivisible items: A survey and new questions. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges*, 20(1):24–40, 2022.
- [9] H. Aziz and S. Mackenzie. A discrete and bounded envy-free cake cutting protocol for any number of agents. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2016 IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on*, pages 416–427. IEEE, 2016.
- [10] É. Bamas and L. Rohwedder. Better trees for santa claus. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1862–1875, 2023.
- [11] S. Barman, D. Kar, and S. Pathak. Parameterized guarantees for almost envy-free allocations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.13791*, 2023.
- [12] S. Barman, S. K. Krishnamurthy, and R. Vaish. Finding fair and efficient allocations. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 557–574, 2018.
- [13] B. A. Berendsohn, S. Boyadzhyska, and L. Kozma. Fixed-point cycles and efx allocations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08753*, 2022.
- [14] B. Berger, A. Cohen, M. Feldman, and A. Fiat. Almost full efx exists for four agents. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 4826–4833, 2022.
- [15] I. Bezáková and V. Dani. Allocating indivisible goods. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges*, 5(3):11–18, 2005.
- [16] S. J. Brams and A. D. Taylor. An envy-free cake division protocol. *American Mathematical Monthly*, pages 9–18, 1995.

- [17] S. J. Brams and A. D. Taylor. *Fair Division: From cake-cutting to dispute resolution*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [18] E. Budish. The combinatorial assignment problem: Approximate competitive equilibrium from equal incomes. *Journal of Political Economy*, 119(6):1061–1103, 2011.
- [19] I. Caragiannis, J. Garg, N. Rathi, E. Sharma, and G. Varricchio. Existence and computation of epistemic efx allocations. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2206, 2022.
- [20] I. Caragiannis, N. Gravin, and X. Huang. Envy-freeness up to any item with high nash welfare: The virtue of donating items. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 527–545, 2019.
- [21] I. Caragiannis, D. Kurokawa, H. Moulin, A. D. Procaccia, N. Shah, and J. Wang. The unreasonable fairness of maximum nash welfare. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 305–322. ACM, 2016.
- [22] I. Caragiannis, D. Kurokawa, H. Moulin, A. D. Procaccia, N. Shah, and J. Wang. The unreasonable fairness of maximum nash welfare. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation (TEAC)*, 7(3):1–32, 2019.
- [23] B. R. Chaudhury, J. Garg, and K. Mehlhorn. Efx exists for three agents. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 1–19, 2020.
- [24] B. R. Chaudhury, J. Garg, K. Mehlhorn, R. Mehta, and P. Misra. Improving efx guarantees through rainbow cycle number. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 310–311, 2021.
- [25] B. R. Chaudhury, T. Kavitha, K. Mehlhorn, and A. Sgouritsa. A little charity guarantees almost envy-freeness. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 50(4):1336–1358, 2021.
- [26] X. Chen, X. Deng, and S.-H. Teng. Settling the complexity of computing two-player nash equilibria. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 56(3):1–57, 2009.
- [27] G. Christodoulou, A. Fiat, E. Koutsoupias, and A. Sgouritsa. Fair allocation in graphs. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 473–488, 2023.
- [28] C. Daskalakis, P. W. Goldberg, and C. H. Papadimitriou. The complexity of computing a nash equilibrium. *Communications of the ACM*, 52(2):89–97, 2009.
- [29] S. Davies, T. Rothvoss, and Y. Zhang. A tale of santa claus, hypergraphs and matroids. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 2748–2757. SIAM, 2020.
- [30] L. E. Dubins and E. H. Spanier. How to cut a cake fairly. *American mathematical monthly*, pages 1–17, 1961.
- [31] S. Even and A. Paz. A note on cake cutting. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 7(3):285–296, 1984.

- [32] A. Farhadi, M. Hajiaghayi, M. Ghodsi, S. Lahaie, D. Pennock, M. Seddighin, S. Seddighin, and H. Yami. Fair allocation of indivisible goods to asymmetric agents. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*, pages 1535–1537. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2017.
- [33] A. Farhadi, M. Hajiaghayi, M. Latifian, M. Seddighin, and H. Yami. Almost envy-freeness, envy-rank, and nash social welfare matchings. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 5355–5362, 2021.
- [34] M. Ghodsi, M. HajiAghayi, M. Seddighin, S. Seddighin, and H. Yami. Fair allocation of indivisible goods: Improvements and generalizations. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 539–556. ACM, 2018.
- [35] L. Gourvès, J. Monnot, and L. Tlilane. Near fairness in matroids. In *ECAI*, volume 14, pages 393–398, 2014.
- [36] P. Hall. On representatives of subsets. *Classic Papers in Combinatorics*, pages 58–62, 1987.
- [37] S. C. Jahan, M. Seddighin, S.-M. Seyed-Javadi, and M. Sharifi. Rainbow cycle number and efx allocations:(almost) closing the gap. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09482*, 2022.
- [38] S. Khot and A. K. Ponnuswami. Approximation algorithms for the max-min allocation problem. In *International Workshop on Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 204–217. Springer, 2007.
- [39] D. Kurokawa, A. D. Procaccia, and J. Wang. Fair enough: Guaranteeing approximate maximin shares. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 65(2):8, 2018.
- [40] R. J. Lipton, E. Markakis, E. Mossel, and A. Saberi. On approximately fair allocations of indivisible goods. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, pages 125–131. ACM, 2004.
- [41] B. Plaut and T. Roughgarde. Almost envy-freeness with general valuations. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 2584–2603. SIAM, 2018.
- [42] A. D. Procaccia. Cake cutting: Not just child’s play. *Communications of the ACM*, 56(7):78–87, 2013.
- [43] A. D. Procaccia. Technical perspective: An answer to fair division’s most enigmatic question. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(4):118–118, 2020.
- [44] H. Steinhaus. The problem of fair division. *Econometrica*, 16(1), 1948.
- [45] W. Stromquist. How to cut a cake fairly. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 87(8):640–644, 1980.

## A Missing Proofs

Lemma A.1 helps us prove some of our claims in Section 6. A Lemma similar to Lemma A.1 has been previously proved by Akrami *et al.* [3]. For completeness, here we restate and prove this lemma.

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $X$  and  $X'$  be two allocations. Define:*

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \{i \mid X_i \neq X'_i\} \\ x &= \min_{i \in A} (v(X_i)) \\ x' &= \min_{i \in A} (v(X'_i)). \end{aligned}$$

*Assume the following conditions hold:*

- $x < x'$ ,
- *There is only one source agent in  $A$  in  $G_{\beta, X}$ ,*
- *If  $i$  is the source agent in  $A$ , then  $v(X_i) = x$ .*

*Then,  $\phi(X) < \phi(X')$ .*

**Proof.** Denote the sources of  $G_{\beta, X}$  by  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k$  and the sources of  $G_{\beta, X'}$  by  $s'_1, s'_2, \dots, s'_{k'}$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(X) &= [v(X_{s_1}), v(X_{s_2}), \dots, v(X_{s_k}), \infty], \\ \phi(X') &= [v(X'_{s'_1}), v(X'_{s'_2}), \dots, v(X'_{s'_{k'}}), \infty]. \end{aligned}$$

Since agent  $i$  is a source in  $G_{\beta, X}$ , we can assume without loss of generality that there exist an index  $l$  such that  $s_l = i$ , and  $v(X_{s_l}) \neq v(X_{s_{l+1}})$ . (we can reorder same values in  $\phi$  to satisfy this condition). We show that for every  $l' < l$  we have  $\phi(X)_{l'} = \phi(X')_{l'}$  and for  $l$  we have  $\phi(X)_l < \phi(X')_l$ .

- For every  $l' < l$ , we claim that  $s_{l'}$  remains a source in  $G_{\beta, X'}$ . To prove this, we show that for every agent  $j$  we have  $v_j(X'_{s_{l'}}) < \beta v_j(X'_j)$ . If  $j \notin A$ , our claim is trivial since  $s_{l'}$  is a source in  $G_{\beta, X}$ . If  $j \in A$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} v_j(X'_{s_{l'}}) &\leq v(X'_{s_{l'}}) \\ &= v(X_{s_{l'}}) && s_{l'} \notin A \\ &\leq x && l' < l, \\ &< x' \\ &\leq v(X'_j) && j \in A, \\ &= v_j(X'_j) \\ &\leq \beta v_j(X'_j). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $j$  does not  $\beta$ -envy  $s_{l'}$  in  $X'$  and  $\phi(X)_{l'} = \phi(X')_{l'}$ .



- To prove  $\phi(X)_l < \phi(X')_l$ , we need to show that for any source agent  $j$  in  $G_{\beta, X'}$  such that  $j \notin \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{l-1}\}$  we have  $v(X'_j) > x = \phi(X)_l$ . We have three cases. The first case is  $j \in A$ . In this case we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(X)_l &= x \\ &< x' \\ &\leq v(X'_j) \end{aligned} \quad j \in A.$$

In the second case we have  $j \notin A$  and  $j$  is also a source in  $G_{\beta, X}$ . In this case we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(X)_l &= x \\ &< v(X_j) && j \notin s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{l-1}, \\ &= v(X'_j) && j \notin A. \end{aligned}$$

In the last case we have  $j \notin A$  and  $j$  is not a source in  $G_{\beta, X}$ . We know there exists another agent  $j' \in A$  such that  $j'$   $\beta$ -envies agent  $j$  in  $G_{\beta, X}$ . Therefore we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(X)_l &= x \\ &< \sqrt{2}x \\ &\leq \sqrt{2}v(X_{j'}) && j' \in A, \\ &< v(X_j) && j' \text{ envies } j \text{ in } X, \\ &= v(X'_j) && j \notin A. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\phi(X')_l$  is replaced with an agent with a larger value, or  $\phi(X')_l = \infty$ .

□.