

Procurement Auctions via Approximately Optimal Submodular Optimization

Yuan Deng
Google Research
dengyuan@google.com

Amin Karbasi
Yale University
amin.karbasi@yale.edu

Vahab Mirrokni
Google Research
mirrokni@google.com

Renato Paes Leme
Google Research
renatopl@google.com

Grigoris Velegkas*
Yale University
grigoris.velegkas@yale.edu

Song Zuo
Google Research
szuo@google.com

Abstract

We study the problem of procurement auctions, in which an auctioneer seeks to acquire services from a group of strategic sellers with private costs. The quality of the services is measured through some submodular function that is known to the auctioneer. Our goal is to design computationally efficient procurement auctions that (approximately) maximize the difference between the quality of the acquired services and the total cost of the sellers, in a way that is incentive compatible (IC) and individual rational (IR) for the sellers, and generates non-negative surplus (NAS) for the auctioneer. Our contribution is twofold: **i)** we provide an improved analysis of existing algorithms for non-positive submodular function maximization and **ii)** we design computationally efficient frameworks that transform submodular function optimization algorithms to mechanisms that are IC and IR for the sellers, NAS for the auctioneer, and approximation-preserving. Our frameworks are general and work both in the offline setting where the auctioneer can observe the bids and the services of all the sellers simultaneously, and in the online setting where the sellers arrive in an adversarial order and the auctioneer has to make an irrevocable decision whether to purchase their service or not.

We further investigate whether it is possible to convert state-of-the-art submodular optimization algorithms into descending auctions. We focus on the adversarial setting, meaning that the schedule of the descending prices is determined by an adversary. We show that a submodular optimization algorithm satisfying bi-criteria $(1/2, 1)$ -approximation in welfare can be effectively converted to a descending auction in this setting. We further establish a connection between descending auctions and online submodular optimization. Finally, we demonstrate the practical applications of our frameworks by instantiating them with different state-of-the-art submodular optimization algorithms and comparing their welfare performance through empirical experiments on publicly available datasets that consist of thousands of sellers.

*Part of the work was done while the author was a student researcher at Google Research.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider procurement auctions [25] in which strategic service sellers with private costs submit bids to an auctioneer, who then decides the set of winners based on an objective function and purchases their services. Procurement auctions have been adopted in multitude of application domains, including industrial procurement [8], data acquisition [70, 71, 28], and crowdsourcing markets [73]. Additionally, Amazon Business provides government procurement solutions for products ranging from office supplies to first responder equipment [12], while the U.S. Government Publishing Office conducts nationwide procurement for items used in publishing [65]. Each of these markets involve thousands of vendors for ensuring supplier diversity and competitive prices.

Since procurement auctions were introduced to the algorithmic game theory community in the seminal paper of Nisan and Ronen [64], many aspects of these auctions have been studied, including frugality in procurement auctions for minimizing purchasing costs [3, 48, 75], budget-feasible procurement auctions in which the purchasing cost is constrained by a budget [72, 51, 20, 6, 4], and profit maximization for optimizing the auctioneer’s surplus [18]. In this paper, we consider the classic setting of procurement auctions with one auctioneer and a group of sellers, \mathcal{N} . Each seller has a *private* cost c_i for providing the service, and for each $S \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, the auctioneer has a value function $f(S)$ for purchasing services from sellers in S . The social welfare obtained from the procurement auction when the auctioneer purchases from sellers in S is given by the difference between the value obtained by the auctioneer and the total cost of sellers in S , i.e., $f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} c_i$.

We note that our objective differs from the utilitarian objective, which maximizes the sum of all agents’ valuations, i.e., $f(S) + \sum_{i \notin S} c_i$, assuming seller i has value c_i if the service is not sold. Our objective can be considered a measure similar to the *gains-from-trade* in the bilateral trade literature, as it measures the *additional* total value generated by running the procurement auction. This is further motivated by the fact that, in many domains where procurement auctions can be applied, sellers incur costs only *after* they have been selected to provide a service. For instance, when a vendor provides goods or services to a company, it is most often the case that they incur costs only after signing the contract and needing to purchase the required materials. Although maximizing gains-from-trade is equivalent to maximizing the utilitarian objective, providing an approximation to the gains-from-trade is considerably harder than providing an approximation to the utilitarian objective. In particular, a non-zero approximation to the utilitarian objective may already be achieved without any trade, which would only result in a zero approximation to gains-from-trade.

Another major obstacle to studying our objective is that maximizing for $f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} c_i$ is a computationally challenging optimization problem, even when f is a *monotone submodular* function. Submodularity captures a broad class of functions with diminishing returns, including gross-substitute functions, budget additive functions, and coverage functions. When f is a monotone submodular function, the aforementioned optimization task is known as *regularized submodular maximization*, expressed as maximizing the difference between a monotone submodular function $f(S)$ and a modular function $\sum_{i \in S} c_i$ as the regularization term. For the special case where $c_i = 0$ for all sellers, it is well-known that obtaining an approximation ratio better than $(1 - 1/e)$ requires exponentially many queries to f [62]. Before a breakthrough result from Sviridenko et al. [74], many heuristics had been proposed in the literature [30, 33, 52], but none of them provided provable guarantees that are universal and unconditional. For example, Feige et al. [33] design algorithms with parameterized approximation guarantees, where the parameterization may depend on classes of instances and the properties of their optimal solutions. Sviridenko et al. [74] show a tight *bi-criteria* (α, β) -approximation guarantee of the form $f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} c_i \geq \alpha \cdot f(\text{OPT}) - \beta \cdot \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}} c_i$ with $\alpha = 1 - 1/e$ and $\beta = 1$, where $\text{OPT} = \arg \max_S f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} c_i$, which rules out the possibility of constant approximation for the welfare objective. Harshaw et al. [41] developed a simplified and practical algorithm, called *the distorted greedy algorithm*, that achieves the same optimal approximation guarantee.

Inspired by recent progress in regularized submodular maximization, we revisit the mechanism design problem of procurement auctions where our objective is to maximize the welfare, i.e., the difference between the value obtained by the auctioneer and the total cost of sellers. Our goal is to design a mechanism that

- is incentive compatible (IC) and individual rational (IR) for each seller;

- guarantees non-negative auctioneer surplus (NAS);
- achieves state-of-the-art bi-criteria welfare guarantees;
- is computationally efficient.

The interpretation of the desired game-theoretical properties, i.e., IC, IR, and NAS, is that IR encourages sellers to participate in the auction while IC prevents strategic behavior and simplifies the sellers' decision-making process. The surplus of the auctioneer is given by $f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} p_i$ for purchasing services from sellers in S , where p_i is the payment to seller $i \in S$. NAS is reminiscent of the weakly budget-balanced property under the interpretation that $f(S)$ captures the potential revenue generated for the auctioneer through the services purchased from sellers in S . The NAS property is critical for many applications; if the auctioneer is at risk of having negative revenue, they might be incentivized not to run the auction at all. Thus, it is crucial to ensure that our transformations from algorithms to mechanisms satisfy NAS, which requires subtle technical work.

1.1 Our Results

In this paper, we make theoretical contributions to the literature of regularized submodular optimizations as well as theoretical and empirical contributions to the literature of procurement auctions.

On the submodular optimization side, Harshaw et al. [41] show that the distorted greedy algorithm satisfies an $(1 - 1/e, 1)$ bi-criteria approximation guarantee. In Section 3, we demonstrate that the distorted greedy algorithm also satisfies $(1 - e^{-\beta}, \beta + o(1))$ bi-criteria approximation simultaneously for all $\beta \in [0, 1]$, which is also almost tight [34]. Using the framework developed in this work, we immediately obtain mechanisms that satisfy the same approximation guarantees for all $\beta \in [0, 1]$. We also extend the results to the setting with noisy function evaluations.

Moving on to the mechanism design side in Section 4, from a theoretical perspective, we first show that VCG mechanisms satisfy IC, IR, and NAS, and they are always welfare-optimal, but it is computationally prohibitive to implement them for practical applications. We then develop a mechanism design framework that can convert state-of-the-art submodular optimization algorithms to sealed-bid mechanisms that satisfy IC, IR and NAS, preserve the bi-criteria welfare guarantees, and can be computed efficiently. Leveraging online submodular optimization algorithms, we extend our framework to the online setting where the sellers arrive in a potentially adversarial order and the auctioneer has to make an irrevocable decision whether to purchase their services or not.

In addition to sealed-bid mechanisms, in Section 5 we ask whether it is possible to convert submodular optimization algorithms to descending auctions. These auctions were initially designed under the assumption that f is a gross-substitute function [50], which is a subclass of submodular functions. We focus on the adversarial setting where the schedule of descending prices is determined by an adversary. We show that if the demand oracle is based on the cost-scaled greedy algorithm [63], the descending auction always achieves bi-criteria $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ -approximation in welfare, even in the adversarial setting. On the other hand, we show that if the oracle solves the demand problem exactly, the approximation guarantees could be arbitrarily bad. We further establish a connection between descending auctions and online submodular optimization algorithms, showing that any online submodular optimization algorithm can be converted to a descending auction in an approximation-preserving way. Thus, an impossibility result, showing there is no descending auction that can achieve bi-criteria $(\alpha, 1)$ -approximation in welfare with $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$, directly implies an impossibility result on online submodular optimization with bi-criteria $(\alpha, 1)$ -approximation guarantees for the same α , which is a long-standing open question in online submodular optimization.

In Section 6, we complement our theoretical results with empirical studies evaluating the welfare performance and running time trade-offs of different mechanisms on a publicly available coverage problem. Due to space constraints, the discussions of further related work are deferred to Appendix A.

2 Preliminaries

We consider a setting of procurement auctions with one auctioneer and a set \mathcal{N} of n sellers with items to sell. The auctioneer has a valuation function $f : 2^{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ that specifies the value that the auctioneer

assigns to the items of every set S of sellers, where $S \subseteq \mathcal{N}$. Each seller $i \in \mathcal{N}$ has a private cost $c_i \geq 0$ indicating the minimum acceptable payment for selling to the auctioneer. We focus on functions f that are monotone and submodular with $f(\emptyset) = 0$. A function f is monotone if $f(S) \leq f(T)$ for all $S \subseteq T \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, and submodular if it satisfies the property of diminishing returns: $f(i | S) \geq f(i | T)$ for all $S \subseteq T \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ and $i \notin T$, where $f(i | S) = f(S \cup \{i\}) - f(S)$ computes the marginal contribution of seller i to f , conditioned on S . Throughout the paper, we use bold symbols \mathbf{x} to represent a vector with n elements (x_1, \dots, x_n) and use $\mathbf{x}_{(a,b)}$ to represent (x_a, \dots, x_b) . As usual, we use $-i$ to indicate all the sellers other than seller i .

Let b_i be the reported bid from seller i . A mechanism $M = (a, p)$ consists of an allocation rule $a : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{N}}$ that maps sellers' reported bids \mathbf{b} to a subset of sellers to procure the items, and a payment rule $p : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ that maps sellers' reported bids \mathbf{b} to a vector of payments to each seller. We assume sellers have quasi-linear utilities such that given a bid profile \mathbf{b} and a mechanism M , seller i 's utility is given by $u_i^M(\mathbf{b}) = p(\mathbf{b}) - c_i \cdot \mathbb{1}[i \in a(\mathbf{b})]$. Our goal is to design a mechanism M that is incentive compatible, individual rational, and induces non-negative auctioneer surplus.

- A mechanism is incentive compatible (IC) if it is always an optimal strategy for a seller to report their private cost truthfully, i.e., for any seller i and any \mathbf{b} , $u_i(c_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \geq u_i(\mathbf{b})$.
- A mechanism is individual rational (IR) if a seller's utility is always non-negative if they report truthfully, i.e., for any seller i and any \mathbf{b}_{-i} , $u_i(c_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \geq 0$.
- A mechanism satisfies the non-negative auctioneer surplus (NAS) condition if the acquired value of the auctioneer is at least the total payment to the sellers, i.e., $f(a(\mathbf{b})) \geq \sum_{i \in 1}^n p_i(\mathbf{b})$, for any bid profile \mathbf{b} .

We will refer to mechanisms that satisfy the IC, IR, and NAS conditions as *feasible* mechanisms. We measure the performance of a mechanism by its welfare $f(a(\mathbf{c})) - \sum_{i \in a(\mathbf{c})} c_i$ and let $\text{OPT} = \arg \max_S f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} c_i$, when the definition of f is clear from context. We may also write $c(S) = \sum_{i \in S} c_i$. We say that a mechanism satisfies bi-criteria (α, β) -approximation to the welfare if

$$f(a(\mathbf{c})) - \sum_{i \in a(\mathbf{c})} c_i \geq \max \left\{ 0, \alpha \cdot f(\text{OPT}) - \beta \cdot \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}} c_i \right\}.$$

3 Submodular Optimization Algorithms

We first present several submodular optimization algorithms that will be useful for the derivation of our mechanisms, and provide an improved analysis for the deterministic and stochastic versions of the distorted greedy algorithm [41]. We will demonstrate how to convert all the algorithms from this section to NAS, IC, and IR mechanisms that maintain the approximation guarantees of the underlying algorithms in Section 4.

Recall that in the regularized submodular maximization problem under a cardinality constraint, there is a monotone submodular function $f : 2^{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, a cost $c_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ for each element $i \in \mathcal{N}$, and a cardinality constraint $k \leq n$. All the algorithms we touch upon in this section, and subsequently in our mechanism design framework, share the same paradigm (Algorithm 1): the algorithm maintains a candidate solution set initialized as $S = \emptyset$ and in each round k , it assigns a *score* to each element $i \in \mathcal{N} \setminus S$ based on a scoring function G , which depends on the cost vector \mathbf{c} and possibly the round number k as well as a random seed r (for randomized algorithms). The algorithm then adds the element with the highest non-negative score to S .

We next describe each algorithm in detail, focusing on the corresponding scoring function G . The bi-criteria guarantees of all the algorithms are deferred to Table 1 in Appendix B. To simplify the notation, when we discuss deterministic algorithms, we omit referring to the random seed that G could take as input, and we omit referring to the round number k as input of G when G does not use the round number information.

Greedy-margin [52]. We start with the simplest algorithm, called the greedy-margin algorithm, which is perhaps the most natural approach one could use. This algorithm simply chooses the seller with the

largest difference between their marginal contribution and their cost, i.e., the scoring function is given by

$$G(i, S, \mathbf{c}) = f(i | S) - c_i.$$

Greedy-rate [33]. The greedy-rate algorithm chooses the seller that maximizes the ratio of the difference between their marginal contribution and their cost, over their marginal contribution, i.e., the scoring function is given by

$$G(i, S, \mathbf{c}) = \frac{f(i | S) - c_i}{f(i | S)}.$$

Distorted Greedy [41]. The distorted greedy algorithm shares a similar flavor to the classical algorithm of Nemhauser et al. [62], but with a slightly *distorted* objective with a multiplier $(1 - \frac{1}{n})^{n-k}$ on the marginal contribution in round k :

$$G(i, S, \mathbf{c}, k) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n-k} \cdot f(i | S) - c_i.$$

It is worth highlighting that this scoring function does not have the diminishing-return structure and in particular, it does not stop early even if scores are negative for all remaining candidates.

Stochastic Distorted Greedy [41]. In order to speed up the execution of the distorted greedy algorithm, Harshaw et al. [41] proposed a randomized implementation of it that works as follows. It runs for n iterations and in every iteration k it draws a seller uniformly at random from \mathcal{N} . Assume the random seed r encodes the selected seller in iteration k via $r(k)$. Then, we can define the scoring function as

$$G(i, S, \mathbf{c}, k, r) = 1[i = r(k)] \cdot \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n-k} \cdot f(i | S) - c_i \right).$$

Harshaw et al. [41] showed that, in expectation over the random draws of the sellers, the approximation guarantee of this algorithm does not degrade compared to its deterministic counterpart.

Return-on-Investment (ROI) Greedy [47]. The ROI greedy algorithm chooses the seller that has the largest marginal contribution per unit of their cost among sellers whose cost not exceeding their marginal contribution, i.e., the scoring function is given by

$$G(i, S, \mathbf{c}) = \frac{f(i | S) - c_i}{c_i}.$$

Observe that, ROI greedy is effectively the same as greedy-rate as both algorithms are effectively ranking the sellers in descending order of $\frac{f(i|S)}{c_i}$. Feige et al. [33] provide a parameterized approximation guarantee for this algorithm while Jin et al. [47] demonstrate a unconditional approximation guarantee without paying a linear term on $f(\text{OPT})$, which is desirable when this quantity is large.

Cost-scaled Greedy [63]. The cost-scaled greedy algorithm chooses the seller with the largest difference between their marginal contribution and *twice* their cost, i.e., the scoring function is given by

$$G(i, S, \mathbf{c}) = f(i | S) - 2 \cdot c_i.$$

In fact, the cost-scaled greedy algorithm can also be applied to the online and adversarial setting in which the sellers arrive in an online manner (such that any decision is irrevocable) and the sequence of their arrival is determined by an adversary. In the online and adversarial setting, the algorithm maintains a tentative solution S and adds a newly arrived seller to the solution S if and only if $f(i | S) - 2 \cdot c_i > 0$.

3.1 Improved Analysis for Distorted Greedy

We now explain the improved analysis we propose for the distorted greedy algorithm. Recall that the distorted greedy score of every element $i \in \mathcal{N}$ in every round $1 \leq j \leq k$ of the execution of the algorithm is $(1 - \frac{1}{n})^{k-j} \cdot f(i | S_{j-1}) - c_i$, and the element that maximizes it is added to the current solution, provided that its distorted score is non-negative. Harshaw et al. [41] showed that both versions of the algorithm enjoy (roughly) a $(1 - 1/e, 1)$ -bi-criteria approximation guarantee, which is tight. We show that, in fact, these algorithms satisfy an even stronger guarantee: the distorted greedy algorithm

enjoys $(1 - e^{-\beta}, \beta + o(1))$ -bi-criteria guarantee for all $\beta \in [0, 1]$, where the $o(1)$ term is sub-constant in cardinality k . A similar result holds, in expectation, for the stochastic version of the algorithm. The guarantee of the algorithm holds *simultaneously* for all $\beta \in [0, 1]$, so it does not require parameterization by β .

Theorem 3.1. *Let \mathcal{N} be a universe of n elements, $f : 2^{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a monotone submodular function, and $c : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a cost function. Let OPT be the optimal solution of the objective $\max_{S \subseteq \mathcal{N}, |S| \leq k} \{f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} c_i\}$. Then, the output of the distorted greedy algorithm satisfies $f(R) - \sum_{j \in R} c_j \geq (1 - e^{-\beta})f(\text{OPT}) - (\beta + 1/k) \sum_{j \in \text{OPT}} c_j$, simultaneously for all $\beta \in [0, 1]$.*

The proof, as well as the formal statement for the the algorithm, are postponed to Appendix B. Our main technical insight is to perform a parameterized *analysis* of the potential function argument of Harshaw et al. [41] based on the target value of β that we wish to prove the guarantee for. In other words, given some $\beta \in [0, 1]$, we lower bound the potential function by a β -dependent quantity. This allows us to obtain the stated guarantees for all β simultaneously. A result of Feldman [34] (cf. Theorem B.1) shows that our analysis achieves the Pareto frontier of the bi-criteria guarantees for this problem, up to the $o(1)$ term. Details are deferred to Appendix B.

In Appendix B we present an adaptation of the distorted greedy algorithm that works even when we only have access to an approximate version $F : 2^{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ of valuation function f such that $(1 - \varepsilon)f(S) \leq F(S) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)f(S), \forall S \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ [45]. Gong et al. [38] propose a slight adaptation of the distorted greedy algorithm that performs well when $\varepsilon = O(1/k)$. However, when we convert their algorithm to a mechanism, it is not immediate how to prove the NAS property, since F might not be submodular, which was a crucial property of the function in our later proof of NAS. Thus, we propose a modification of their algorithm to overcome this issue (see Algorithm 8). Our main insight is to have the greedy scores of the elements in round t of the execution depend not only on the current tentative solution S_t , but on the whole trajectory S_1, \dots, S_t . Essentially, this enforces the structure of diminishing returns without hurting the approximation guarantees.

4 A Mechanism Design Framework

In this section, we develop a mechanism design framework that is capable of converting the state-of-the-art submodular optimization algorithms to feasible mechanisms for procurement auctions.

As a warm-up, we first show that the classic VCG framework [78, 21, 39] provides mechanisms that are IC, IR, and welfare-efficient. It turns out that the VCG mechanisms also satisfy NAS.

Proposition 4.1. *The VCG mechanism satisfies NAS when f is a submodular function.*

The proof is postponed to Appendix C. Although VCG mechanisms are IC, IR, NAS, and welfare-efficient, implementing them is computationally prohibitive. We now move on to describing the computationally efficient framework that transforms algorithms to mechanisms, which is one of the main contributions of our work.

Algorithm 1 provides a meta-algorithm $\mathcal{A} = (G)$ for regularized submodular function optimization specified by a scoring rule G , computing a score for a candidate i given a subset S , a vector \mathbf{c} , the round number k , and possibly a random seed r (for randomized algorithms) as input. The algorithm runs for n rounds¹ and maintains a tentative solution set S_k at the end of each round k . In each round k it calls G to compute a score for each candidate not in the tentative solution set S_{k-1} , and then it identifies the candidate i^* with the highest score (where ties are broken lexicographically). If the highest score is positive, $S_k = S_{k-1} \cup \{i^*\}$; otherwise $S_k = S_{k-1}$.

Assumption 4.2. *The meta-algorithm $\mathcal{A} = (G)$ satisfies*

1. *for all i and S with $i \notin S$, $G(i, S, \mathbf{b}, k, r)$ is non-increasing in b_i , for all \mathbf{b}_{-i} , k and r ;*
2. *for all i and S with $i \notin S$, if $b_i > f(i | S)$, then $G(i, S, \mathbf{b}, k, r) < 0$ for all \mathbf{b}_{-i} , k , and r ;*

¹Our framework can be extended to accommodate algorithms that stop early without running all the n iterations. To simplify the exposition, we let the algorithm run for longer by adding extra *dummy* rounds.

ALGORITHM 1: A meta algorithm $\mathcal{A} = (G)$ for submodular optimization

Data: A set of seller \mathcal{N} , a cost profile \mathbf{c} from sellers, and a random seed r

Result: A subset of sellers to purchase services from

```
1  $S_0 = \emptyset$ ;  
2 for  $k$  from 1 to  $n$  do  
3    $i^* = \arg \max_{i \notin S_{k-1}} G(i, S_{k-1}, \mathbf{c}, k, r)$ ;  
4   if  $G(i^*, S_{k-1}, \mathbf{c}, k, r) > 0$  then  
5      $S_k = S_{k-1} \cup \{i^*\}$ ;  
6   end  
7   else  
8      $S_k = S_{k-1}$ ;  
9   end  
10 end  
11 return  $S_n$ ;
```

3. for all i, S with $i \notin S$, k and r , $G(i, S, \mathbf{b}, k, r)$ is independent of \mathbf{b}_{-i} .

We argue that both (1) and (2) of Assumption 4.2 are mild ones and any reasonable meta-algorithm \mathcal{A} should satisfy it. For instance, all the algorithms we present in Table 1 satisfy these assumptions.

In particular, Assumption 4.2(1) states that the scoring function G should be non-increasing as the reported bid b_i increases, which is a natural requirement as a candidate with a smaller reported bid is more favorable. Assumption 4.2(2) states that the algorithm should not pick a candidate whose marginal contribution is smaller than their reported bid. Under truthful reporting, such a candidate has a negative marginal contribution in round k towards the social welfare, and therefore, they should not be included to the solution. Assumption 4.2(3) is a stronger assumption, stating that the score for a seller i should be independent of bids from other sellers, but to the best of our knowledge, almost all state-of-the-art algorithms satisfy this assumption. In fact, for our mechanism to satisfy the desired properties we can relax Assumption 4.2(3) to require: for all i, S with $i \in S$, k , and r , for any \mathbf{b} , if $i \neq \arg \max_{\ell \notin S} G(\ell, S, \mathbf{b}, k, r)$, then for any $b'_i > b_i$, $\arg \max_{\ell \notin S} G(\ell, S, (b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}), k, r) = \arg \max_{\ell \notin S} G(\ell, S, \mathbf{b}, k, r)$. In other words, as long as seller i does not have the highest score, then the candidate with the highest score remains the same. Such a property is similar to the *non-bossiness* property recently studied by Paes Leme et al. [67].

Given a meta algorithm \mathcal{A} specified by Algorithm 1, Algorithm 2 first runs Algorithm 1 with the reported bids as input in order to obtain the set of sellers S^* whose items will be purchased. Then, the payment for each seller $i \in S^*$ is computed in the following way: we re-run \mathcal{A} by raising the bid from seller i to infinity and record the intermediate solutions $\{S_0, S_1, \dots, S_n\}$. For each S_k , we compute the supremum of the set of bids $b_i \geq 0$ satisfying $i = \arg \max_{\ell \notin S_k} G(\ell, S_k, \mathbf{b}, k, r)$ and $G(i, S_k, \mathbf{b}, k, r) > 0$. If such a non-negative bid does not exist, the sup function takes a default value of 0. Finally, p_i is computed by taking the max across $k \in [n]$.

ALGORITHM 2: A feasible mechanism construction for a given meta algorithm \mathcal{A}

Data: A set of sellers \mathcal{N} , a bid profile \mathbf{b} from sellers, and a meta algorithm \mathcal{A}

Result: A subset of sellers to purchase from and a vector of payment to sellers

```
1 Generate a random seed  $r$  if needed or set  $r = 0$ ;  
2  $S^* = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{b}, r)$ ;  
3 for  $i \in S^*$  do  
4   Run  $\mathcal{A}((\infty, \mathbf{b}_{-i}), r)$  and record  $\{S_0, S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ ;  
5    $p_i = 0$ ;  
6   for  $k \in [n]$  do  
7      $p_i = \max(p_i, \sup \{b_i \mid G(i, S_{k-1}, \mathbf{b}, k, r) > 0\})$ ;  
8      $p_i = \max(p_i, \sup \{b_i \mid i = \arg \max_{\ell \notin S_k} G(\ell, S_{k-1}, \mathbf{b}, k, r)\})$ ;  
9   end  
10 end  
11 return  $S^*$  and  $\mathbf{p}$ ;
```

Theorem 4.3. *For a meta-algorithm $\mathcal{A} = (G)$ satisfying Assumption 4.2, the mechanism constructed using Algorithm 2 is feasible.*

The proof is postponed to Appendix C. To show the IC and the IR properties, we make use of Myerson [60] together with our carefully designed payment rule with Assumption 4.2(1) and 4.2(3). It is more technically difficult to establish the NAS property, where we make use of the submodularity property of f and Assumption 4.2(2). It is worth highlighting that Theorem 4.3 does not require the scoring function G to have a diminishing-return structure, i.e., $G(i, S, \mathbf{b}, j, r) \geq G(i, T, \mathbf{b}, k, r)$ for all $S \subseteq T$ and $j \leq k$; and the distorted greedy algorithm does not satisfy such a structure.

With Theorem 4.3, we establish a framework for converting a submodular optimization algorithm to a mechanism satisfying IC, IR, and NAS. In such a mechanism, the sellers are incentivized to submit their true private costs as their bids, and therefore, the mechanism preserves the bi-criteria welfare approximation guarantee, which follows immediately from the fact that under truthful bidding the allocations of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 coincide.

4.1 Online Mechanism Design Framework

In this section we shift our attention to the online setting, where each seller $i \in \mathcal{N}$ arrives online in an arbitrary order and the auctioneer needs to make an irrevocable decision of whether to buy the item or not. For convenience, assume seller k arrives in round k . A meta-algorithm $\mathcal{A}^o = (G)$ for online submodular optimization is provided in Algorithm 3, where the scoring function G in round k computes a score for a seller k given a subset S , a vector $\mathbf{c}_{(1,k)}$, and possibly a random seed r as input. The algorithm maintains a tentative solution S_k at the end of each round k . In each round k , seller k is added to the tentative solution if and only if the scoring function returns a positive score. From the taxation principle, we can focus on (possibly randomized) *posted-price* mechanisms for designing IC and IR mechanisms, i.e., in each round k , the auctioneer makes a take-it-or-leave-it price $p_k \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ for seller k . We provide an approximation-preserving transformation from online algorithms to posted-price mechanisms in Algorithm 4. Our main insight is to map the (online) scores to posted prices in an approximation preserving way. The formal proof is postponed to Appendix C.1. Similarly as in the offline setting, we require that the online submodular optimization algorithm satisfies the following mild assumptions.

Assumption 4.4. *The meta-algorithm $\mathcal{A}^o = (G)$ satisfies*

1. *for all $k, S, \mathbf{b}_{(1,k-1)}$ and r , $G(k, S, \mathbf{b}_{(1,k)}, r)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing in b_k ;*
2. *for all $k, S, \mathbf{b}_{(1,k-1)}$ and r , if $b_k > f(k | S)$, then $G(k, S, \mathbf{b}_{(1,k)}, r) < 0$.*

In particular, we drop the counterpart of Assumption 4.2(3) in the online setting, but we additionally require G to be continuous and strictly decreasing to avoid tie-breaking issues so that the equation $G(k, S, (\mathbf{b}_{(1,k-1)}, z), r) = 0$ has a unique solution in terms of z .

Theorem 4.5. *For a meta-algorithm $\mathcal{A}^o = (G)$ satisfying Assumption 4.4, the online mechanism constructed using Algorithm 4 is IC, IR, NAS, and outputs the same solution as Algorithm 3 under full knowledge of the cost of the items.*

As we alluded to before in Section 3, the cost-scaled greedy algorithm [63] gives a $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ -bi-criteria approximation guarantee in the online setting and fits within the template we have provided. Similarly, an adaptation of this algorithm by Wang et al. [80] gives $(\beta - \alpha/\beta, \beta - \alpha/\alpha), 0 < \alpha \leq \beta$ parameterized bi-criteria guarantees in the online setting, and, interestingly, can also handle matroid constraints. In addition, Wang et al. [79] provide parameterized bi-criteria guarantees adapting the algorithm from Nikolakaki et al. [63]. In the case of noisy evaluations of the function f , our framework can be applied to the noise-robust algorithm from Gong et al. [38], which builds upon Nikolakaki et al. [63].

ALGORITHM 3: A meta algorithm $\mathcal{A}^\circ = (G)$ for online submodular optimization

Data: A set of sellers arriving online and a random seed r

Result: A subset S^* of sellers to purchase from

```
1  $S_0 = \emptyset, k = 0;$ 
2 while there exists a newly arrived seller  $k + 1$  with cost  $c_{k+1}$  do
3    $k = k + 1;$ 
4   if  $G(k, S_{k-1}, c_{(1,k)}, r) > 0$  then
5      $S_k = S_{k-1} \cup \{k\};$ 
6   end
7   else
8      $S_k = S_{k-1};$ 
9   end
10 end
11 return  $S_k;$ 
```

ALGORITHM 4: A posted-price mechanism construction for a given meta algorithm \mathcal{A}°

Data: A set of sellers arriving online and a meta algorithm \mathcal{A}°

Result: A subset of sellers to purchase from and a vector of payment to sellers

```
1 Generate a random seed  $r$  if needed or set  $r = 0;$ 
2  $S_0 = \emptyset, k = 0;$ 
3 while there exists a newly arrived seller  $k + 1$  do
4    $k = k + 1;$ 
5   Let  $\hat{p}_k$  be the unique solution of the equation  $G(k, S_{k-1}, (c_{(1,k-1)}, z), r) = 0$  in terms of  $z;$ 
6   Post price  $\hat{p}_k$  to seller  $k;$ 
7   if Seller  $k$  accepts the posted price then
8      $S_k = S_{k-1} \cup \{k\};$ 
9      $p_k = \hat{p}_k;$ 
10  end
11  else
12     $S_k = S_{k-1};$ 
13     $p_k = 0;$ 
14  end
15 end
16 return  $S_k$  and  $\mathbf{p};$ 
```

5 Descending Auctions

The mechanism design framework developed in Section 4 has a sealed-bid format. In this section, we investigate another popular class of procurement auctions, called *descending auctions*. A descending auction is parameterized by a demand oracle \mathcal{D} , which takes a set of sellers $S \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ and a vector of prices \mathbf{p} as input and returns a subset of sellers $\mathcal{D}(S, \mathbf{p}) \subseteq S$. The auction maintains a set of active sellers S , initialized to be \mathcal{N} , and a vector of prices \mathbf{p} , where p_i is initialized to be $f(i \mid \emptyset)$, the highest possible marginal contribution from seller i . In each iteration, the auction calls \mathcal{D} :

- If $\mathcal{D}(S, \mathbf{p}) = S$, the descending auction ends and returns the current S as the set of sellers to purchase from and \mathbf{p} as the vector of payment to sellers
- If $\mathcal{D}(S, \mathbf{p}) \subsetneq S$, an active seller i not in $\mathcal{D}(S, \mathbf{p})$ is chosen and seller i 's price p_i is decreased by a sufficiently small step size ε . If p_i is smaller than b_i , then seller i is removed from the active seller set and p_i is set to 0.

Algorithm 5 provides a classic paradigm of such auctions. Note that the descending auction is always IR since seller i is chosen only if the final price p_i is at least b_i , and IC since the reported bid b_i is only used for checking whether the current price p_i is smaller than b_i , which also enables the implementation without eliciting sealed bids from sellers in which whenever p_i is lowered, the auctioneer

ALGORITHM 5: Descending auction with a demand oracle \mathcal{D} and a step size of ε

Data: A set of sellers \mathcal{N} and a bid profile \mathbf{b} from sellers

Result: A subset S^* of sellers to purchase from and a vector of payment to sellers

```
1 Set the set of active sellers as  $S = \mathcal{N}$ ;  
2 Set initial prices as  $p_i = f(i \mid \emptyset)$ ;  
3 while  $\mathcal{D}(S, \mathbf{p}) \subsetneq S$  do  
4   | Select an arbitrary seller  $i \in S \setminus \mathcal{D}(S, \mathbf{p})$ ;  
5   |  $p_i = p_i - \varepsilon$ ;  
6   | if  $p_i < b_i$  then  
7   |   |  $S = S \setminus \{i\}$ ;  
8   |   |  $p_i = 0$ ;  
9   | end  
10 end  
11 return  $S$  and  $\mathbf{p}$ ;
```

asks the seller whether they would like to leave the market. This has the appealing property that for the set of the winning sellers, the auctioneer only learns an upper bound on their true valuation, instead of their actual valuation, which is always the case in sealed-bid auctions. Another advantage of descending auctions is that they satisfy *obviously strategyproofness* [54]. Moreover, NAS can be achieved if $f(\mathcal{D}(S, \mathbf{p})) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}(S, \mathbf{p})} p_i \geq 0$ always holds.

Descending auctions were initially designed under the assumption that f is a gross-substitute function, a subclass of submodular functions. In particular, when f is a gross-substitute function, the demand oracle that exactly solves the welfare optimization problem can be computed in polynomial time; and with such an oracle, the descending auction returns the optimal subset OPT , even if it is executed in *the adversarial setting*, i.e., where the selection of seller i not in $\mathcal{D}(S, \mathbf{p})$ for price decrement is determined by an adversary [50, 66].

Descending Auctions in the Adversarial Setting. We first show that when f is a submodular function, in the adversarial setting, a descending auction may return an arbitrarily worse solution even with the exact demand oracle satisfying bi-criteria $(1, 1)$ -approximation in welfare. The proof is postponed to Appendix D.

Theorem 5.1. *In the adversarial setting, given demand oracle \mathcal{D} satisfying bi-criteria $(1, 1)$ -approximation in welfare, for any $L \in \mathbb{N}_+$, there exists a problem instance with $L + 2$ sellers and a vector of bids \mathbf{b} , such that Algorithm 5 with demand oracle \mathcal{D} and $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{L}$ returns a subset S^* with $f(S^*) - \sum_{i \in S^*} b_i = O(\frac{1}{L}) \cdot (f(\text{OPT}) - \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}} b_i)$.*

We complement our negative result by designing a demand oracle based on the cost-scaled greedy algorithm of [63], which leads to a descending auction with $(1/2, 1)$ -approximation guarantees. The proof is postponed to Appendix D.

Theorem 5.2. *There exists a demand oracle $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ satisfying bi-criteria $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ -approximation in welfare such that, Algorithm 5 with demand oracle $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ always returns a subset S^* satisfying $f(S^*) - \sum_{i \in S^*} b_i \geq \frac{1}{2} f(\text{OPT}) - \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}} b_i - n\varepsilon$ in the adversarial setting.*

Remark 5.3. *We remark that our results show a, perhaps, counter-intuitive phenomenon in the adversarial setting: there are instances in which if we run the descending auction described in Algorithm 5 with the perfect demand oracle we will end up with welfare that is arbitrarily worse than the execution with the oracle based on Nikolakaki et al. [63]. In particular, the family of problems that witnesses the lower bound in Theorem 5.2 shows that for every $L > 0$, there is an instance in which the solution S^* that we get through the perfect oracle satisfies $f(S^*) - \sum_{i \in S^*} b_i < 1$, whereas the solution \hat{S} that we get through the scaled-greedy oracle satisfies $f(\hat{S}) - \sum_{i \in \hat{S}} b_i \geq L/2 - 1$.*

From Online Submodular Optimization to Descending Auctions. We demonstrate a reduction from online submodular optimization to descending auctions when the selection of seller i not in $\mathcal{D}(S, \mathbf{p})$ for price decrement can be controlled by the auctioneer. Recall that we have demonstrated that an online submodular optimization algorithm (Algorithm 3) that satisfies Assumption 4.4 can be converted

to an (online) posted-price auction that preserves the bi-criteria welfare guarantee. As posted-price auctions can be implemented by descending auctions with a tailored schedule of descending prices, an online submodular optimization algorithm (Algorithm 3) that satisfies Assumption 4.4 can also be converted to a descending auction that preserves the bi-criteria welfare guarantee (see Algorithm 9 in appendix D). Thus, an impossibility result, showing there is no descending auction that can achieve bi-criteria $(\alpha, 1)$ -approximation in welfare with $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$, directly implies an impossibility result on online submodular optimization with bi-criteria $(\alpha, 1)$ -approximation guarantees for the same α , which is a long-standing open question for online submodular optimization. We leave this as an interesting open question for future research.

6 Experiments

In this section, we empirically evaluate the welfare performance and running time trade-offs of various mechanisms on a publicly available coverage problem. Our instances are constructed using a bipartite graph from SNAP (<https://snap.stanford.edu/data/wiki-Vote.html>). The graph consists of approximately 7000 nodes representing *sets* and 2800 nodes representing *vertices* to be covered by the sets. We consider the value of covering each vertex and the cost of selecting each set based on the degrees of the corresponding nodes. We define the value of $f(S)$ as the sum of the values from vertices covered by at least one selected set, i.e., $f(S) = \sum_{i \in \bigcup_{s \in S} s} v_i$. To create instances with varying sizes and value-to-cost ratios, for each pair (n, s) , we randomly sample subsets of the sets of size n and scale their costs using $\kappa \sim U[s, s^2]$. We generate 10000 random instances per (n, s) .

Since VCG needs to solve exactly $\arg \max_S f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} c_i$ we solve the optimization problem using a mixed integer program (MIP), when n is relatively small. Figure 1 shows the running time comparison of different methods, while welfare results are shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3. In summary:

- VCG computes both VCG allocation and payment;
- Optimal Welfare computes VCG allocation (i.e., the welfare-optimal allocation) only;
- For Descending Auction (DA) with an unspecified oracle, we implement it with a demand oracle that computes the welfare-optimal allocation.

In addition, we experiment with Greedy-margin, Greedy-rate, Distorted Greedy, and Cost-scaled Greedy, introduced in Section 3 and their DA variants. In Appendix E, we explain a heuristic approach, based on lazy implementations of the classical greedy algorithm [58], to speed up the computation for both allocation and payment.




Figure 1: Average running time for different mechanisms at different sample sizes n . Note that both axes are log-scaled.

Running Time Comparison Figure 1 shows the average running time for different mechanisms. VCG, Descending Auction, and Optimal Welfare exhibit super-polynomial complexity due to MIP computations,

with Descending Auction being the slowest. Greedy-based algorithms demonstrate polynomial complexity, but Distorted Greedy’s time grows faster due to the absence of a diminishing-return structure, so the approach from Appendix E does not apply.

Welfare Comparison Figure 2 and Figure 3 compare welfare of various mechanisms for varying sample sizes. Instances are grouped by the fraction of active agents, determined by whether their marginal contribution exceeds their cost. In particular, for valuation function f and cost vector \mathbf{c} , the fraction of active agents is $|\{i \in \mathcal{N} \mid f(i \mid \emptyset) > c_i\}|/|\mathcal{N}|$, which decreases as the cost multiplier κ increases. When feasible to run, DA with an optimal oracle outperforms other auctions. This contrasts our theoretical result, which shows that in pathological instances, DA with an optimal oracle can be arbitrarily worse than cost-scaled greedy. Across approximation algorithms, we observe that the direct implementations consistently outperform their DA variants, with an ordering of Greedy-margin $>$ Greedy-rate $>$ Cost-scaled Greedy $>$ Distorted Greedy.




Figure 2: Welfare as a function of the fraction of active agents for $n \in \{100, 200, 500\}$.

7 Conclusion

In this work we propose a new procurement auction setting inspired by the recent development in regularized submodular optimizations. Our results enable computational and welfare efficient transformations from regularized submodular maximization algorithms to various types of mechanisms, including sealed-bid auctions and descending auctions, that satisfy several desirable properties such as NAS, IC, and IR. Moreover, we have experimentally tested our framework on several large-scale instances which showcases its practical applicability.




Figure 3: Welfare as a function of the fraction of active agents for $n \in \{1000, 2000, 4000\}$.

References

- [1] Georgios Amanatidis, Pieter Kleer, and Guido Schäfer. Budget-feasible mechanism design for non-monotone submodular objectives: Offline and online. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 901–919, 2019.
- [2] Nima Anari, Gagan Goel, and Afshin Nikzad. Mechanism design for crowdsourcing: An optimal $1-1/e$ competitive budget-feasible mechanism for large markets. In *2014 IEEE 55th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 266–275. IEEE, 2014.
- [3] Aaron Archer and Éva Tardos. Frugal path mechanisms. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 3(1):1–22, 2007.
- [4] Eric Balkanski, Pranav Garimidi, Vasilis Gkatzelis, Daniel Schoepflin, and Xizhi Tan. Deterministic budget-feasible clock auctions. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2940–2963. SIAM, 2022.
- [5] Xiaohui Bei and Zhiyi Huang. Bayesian Incentive Compatibility via Fractional Assignments. In *the Twenty-Second Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, 2011.
- [6] Xiaohui Bei, Ning Chen, Nick Gravin, and Pinyan Lu. Budget feasible mechanism design: from prior-free to bayesian. In *Proceedings of the forty-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 449–458, 2012.
- [7] Xiaohui Bei, Ning Chen, Nick Gravin, and Pinyan Lu. Worst-case mechanism design via bayesian analysis. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 46(4):1428–1448, 2017.
- [8] Martin Bichler, Andrew Davenport, Gail Hohner, and Jayant Kalagnanam. Industrial procurement auctions. *Combinatorial auctions*, 1:593–612, 2006.
- [9] Liad Blumrosen and Shahar Dobzinski. (almost) efficient mechanisms for bilateral trading. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 130:369–383, 2021.
- [10] Liad Blumrosen and Yehonatan Mizrahi. Approximating gains-from-trade in bilateral trading. In *Web and Internet Economics: 12th International Conference, WINE 2016, Montreal, Canada, December 11-14, 2016, Proceedings 12*, pages 400–413. Springer, 2016.
- [11] Johannes Brustle, Yang Cai, Fa Wu, and Mingfei Zhao. Approximating gains from trade in two-sided markets via simple mechanisms. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 589–590, 2017.
- [12] Amazon Business. Government procurement solutions, 2024. URL <https://business.amazon.com/en/work-with-us/government>. Last accessed October 2024.
- [13] Yang Cai, Constantinos Daskalakis, and S Matthew Weinberg. An algorithmic characterization of multi-dimensional mechanisms. In *Proceedings of the forty-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 459–478, 2012.
- [14] Yang Cai, Constantinos Daskalakis, and S Matthew Weinberg. Optimal multi-dimensional mechanism design: Reducing revenue to welfare maximization. In *2012 IEEE 53rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 130–139. IEEE, 2012.
- [15] Yang Cai, Constantinos Daskalakis, and S Matthew Weinberg. Reducing revenue to welfare maximization: Approximation algorithms and other generalizations. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 578–595. SIAM, 2013.
- [16] Yang Cai, Constantinos Daskalakis, and S Matthew Weinberg. Understanding incentives: Mechanism design becomes algorithm design. In *2013 IEEE 54th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 618–627. IEEE, 2013.

- [17] Yang Cai, Kira Goldner, Steven Ma, and Mingfei Zhao. On multi-dimensional gains from trade maximization. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1079–1098. SIAM, 2021.
- [18] Matthew Cary, Abraham D Flaxman, Jason D Hartline, and Anna R Karlin. Auctions for structured procurement. In *SODA*, volume 8, pages 304–313, 2008.
- [19] Shuchi Chawla, Nicole Immorlica, and Brendan Lucier. On the limits of black-box reductions in mechanism design. In *Proceedings of the forty-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 435–448, 2012.
- [20] Ning Chen, Nick Gravin, and Pinyan Lu. On the approximability of budget feasible mechanisms. In *Proceedings of the twenty-second annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 685–699. SIAM, 2011.
- [21] Edward H Clarke. Multipart pricing of public goods. *Public choice*, 11(1):17–33, 1971.
- [22] Riccardo Colini-Baldeschi, Bart de Keijzer, Stefano Leonardi, and Stefano Turchetta. Approximately efficient double auctions with strong budget balance. In *Proceedings of the twenty-seventh annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 1424–1443. SIAM, 2016.
- [23] Riccardo Colini-Baldeschi, Paul W Goldberg, Bart de Keijzer, Stefano Leonardi, Tim Roughgarden, and Stefano Turchetta. Approximately efficient two-sided combinatorial auctions. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation (TEAC)*, 8(1):1–29, 2020.
- [24] Yuan Deng, Jieming Mao, Balasubramanian Sivan, and Kangning Wang. Approximately efficient bilateral trade. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 718–721, 2022.
- [25] Nicola Dimitri, Gustavo Piga, and Giancarlo Spagnolo. *Handbook of procurement*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [26] Shahar Dobzinski, Christos H Papadimitriou, and Yaron Singer. Mechanisms for complement-free procurement. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, pages 273–282, 2011.
- [27] Shaddin Dughmi, Jason D Hartline, Robert Kleinberg, and Rad Niazadeh. Bernoulli factories and black-box reductions in mechanism design. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 158–169. ACM, 2017.
- [28] Alireza Fallah, Ali Makhdoumi, Azarakhsh Malekian, and Asuman Ozdaglar. Optimal and differentially private data acquisition: Central and local mechanisms. *Operations Research*, 2023.
- [29] Yumou Fei. Improved approximation to first-best gains-from-trade. In *International Conference on Web and Internet Economics*, pages 204–218. Springer, 2022.
- [30] Ureil Feige, Nicole Immorlica, Vahab Mirrokni, and Hamid Nazerzadeh. A combinatorial allocation mechanism with penalties for banner advertising. In *Proceedings of the 17th international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 169–178, 2008.
- [31] Uriel Feige. A threshold of $\ln n$ for approximating set cover. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 45(4): 634–652, 1998.
- [32] Uriel Feige, Vahab S Mirrokni, and Jan Vondrák. Maximizing non-monotone submodular functions. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 40(4):1133–1153, 2011.
- [33] Uriel Feige, Nicole Immorlica, Vahab S Mirrokni, and Hamid Nazerzadeh. Pass approximation: A framework for analyzing and designing heuristics. *Algorithmica*, 66:450–478, 2013.
- [34] Moran Feldman. Guess free maximization of submodular and linear sums. *Algorithmica*, 83(3): 853–878, 2021.

- [35] Hu Fu, Robert Kleinberg, and Ron Lavi. Conditional equilibrium outcomes via ascending price processes with applications to combinatorial auctions with item bidding. In *EC*, page 586. Citeseer, 2012.
- [36] Mengxue Geng, Shufang Gong, Bin Liu, and Weili Wu. Bicriteria algorithms for maximizing the difference between submodular function and linear function under noise. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Applications in Management*, pages 133–143. Springer, 2022.
- [37] Qinqin Gong, Suixiang Gao, Fengmin Wang, and Ruiqi Yang. A multi-pass streaming algorithm for regularized submodular maximization. In *Combinatorial Optimization and Applications: 15th International Conference, COCOA 2021, Tianjin, China, December 17–19, 2021, Proceedings 15*, pages 701–711. Springer, 2021.
- [38] Shufang Gong, Bin Liu, Mengxue Geng, and Qizhi Fang. Algorithms for maximizing monotone submodular function minus modular function under noise. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 45(4):96, 2023.
- [39] Theodore Groves. Incentives in teams. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 617–631, 1973.
- [40] Kai Han, You Wu, He Huang, and Shuang Cui. Triple eagle: Simple, fast and practical budget-feasible mechanisms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [41] Chris Harshaw, Moran Feldman, Justin Ward, and Amin Karbasi. Submodular maximization beyond non-negativity: Guarantees, fast algorithms, and applications. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2634–2643. PMLR, 2019.
- [42] Jason Hartline, Robert Kleinberg, and Azarakhsh Malekian. Bayesian incentive compatibility via matchings. In *the 22nd Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, 2011.
- [43] Jason D. Hartline and Brendan Lucier. Bayesian Algorithmic Mechanism Design. In *the 42nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, 2010.
- [44] Jason D Hartline, Robert Kleinberg, and Azarakhsh Malekian. Bayesian incentive compatibility via matchings. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 92:401–429, 2015.
- [45] Thibaut Horel and Yaron Singer. Maximization of approximately submodular functions. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- [46] Pooya Jalaly Khalilabadi and Éva Tardos. Simple and efficient budget feasible mechanisms for monotone submodular valuations. In *International Conference on Web and Internet Economics*, pages 246–263. Springer, 2018.
- [47] Tianyuan Jin, Yu Yang, Renchi Yang, Jieming Shi, Keke Huang, and Xiaokui Xiao. Unconstrained submodular maximization with modular costs: Tight approximation and application to profit maximization. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 14(10):1756–1768, 2021.
- [48] Anna R Karlin and David Kempe. Beyond vcg: Frugality of truthful mechanisms. In *46th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS’05)*, pages 615–624. IEEE, 2005.
- [49] Ehsan Kazemi, Shervin Minaee, Moran Feldman, and Amin Karbasi. Regularized submodular maximization at scale. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5356–5366. PMLR, 2021.
- [50] Alexander S Kelso Jr and Vincent P Crawford. Job matching, coalition formation, and gross substitutes. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1483–1504, 1982.
- [51] David Kempe, Mahyar Salek, and Cristopher Moore. Frugal and truthful auctions for vertex covers, flows and cuts. In *2010 IEEE 51st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 745–754. IEEE, 2010.

- [52] Jon Kleinberg, Christos Papadimitriou, and Prabhakar Raghavan. Segmentation problems. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 51(2):263–280, 2004.
- [53] Benny Lehmann, Daniel Lehmann, and Noam Nisan. Combinatorial auctions with decreasing marginal utilities. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 18–28, 2001.
- [54] Shengwu Li. Obviously strategy-proof mechanisms. *American Economic Review*, 107(11):3257–3287, 2017.
- [55] Cheng Lu, Wenguo Yang, and Suixiang Gao. Regularized nonmonotone submodular maximization. *Optimization*, pages 1–27, 2023.
- [56] Cheng Lu, Wenguo Yang, and Suixiang Gao. Streaming algorithms for maximizing the difference of submodular functions and the sum of submodular and supermodular functions. *Optimization Letters*, pages 1–25, 2023.
- [57] R Preston McAfee. A dominant strategy double auction. *Journal of economic Theory*, 56(2):434–450, 1992.
- [58] Michel Minoux. Accelerated greedy algorithms for maximizing submodular set functions. In *Optimization Techniques: Proceedings of the 8th IFIP Conference on Optimization Techniques Würzburg, September 5–9, 1977*, pages 234–243. Springer, 2005.
- [59] Siddharth Mitra, Moran Feldman, and Amin Karbasi. Submodular+ concave. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:11577–11591, 2021.
- [60] Roger B Myerson. Optimal auction design. *Mathematics of operations research*, 6(1):58–73, 1981.
- [61] Roger B Myerson and Mark A Satterthwaite. Efficient mechanisms for bilateral trading. *Journal of economic theory*, 29(2):265–281, 1983.
- [62] George L Nemhauser, Laurence A Wolsey, and Marshall L Fisher. An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions—i. *Mathematical programming*, 14:265–294, 1978.
- [63] Sofia Maria Nikolakaki, Alina Ene, and Evimaria Terzi. An efficient framework for balancing submodularity and cost. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 1256–1266, 2021.
- [64] Noam Nisan and Amir Ronen. Algorithmic mechanism design. In *Proceedings of the thirty-first annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 129–140, 1999.
- [65] U.S. Government Publishing Office. Nationwide procurement, 2024. URL <https://www.gpo.gov/how-to-work-with-us/agency/services-for-agencies/nationwide-procurement-programs>. Last accessed October 2024.
- [66] Renato Paes Leme. Gross substitutability: An algorithmic survey. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 106:294–316, 2017.
- [67] Renato Paes Leme, Jon Schneider, and Hanrui Zhang. Nonbossy mechanisms: Mechanism design robust to secondary goals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.11967*, 2023.
- [68] Christos Papadimitriou and Mihalis Yannakakis. Optimization, approximation, and complexity classes. In *Proceedings of the twentieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 229–234, 1988.
- [69] Benjamin Qi. On maximizing sums of non-monotone submodular and linear functions. *Algorithmica*, pages 1–55, 2023.
- [70] Aaron Roth and Grant Schoenebeck. Conducting truthful surveys, cheaply. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 826–843, 2012.

- [71] Rachael Hwee Ling Sim, Xinyi Xu, and Bryan Kian Hsiang Low. Data valuation in machine learning: “ingredients”, strategies, and open challenges. In *Proc. IJCAI*, pages 5607–5614, 2022.
- [72] Yaron Singer. Budget feasible mechanisms. In *2010 IEEE 51st Annual Symposium on foundations of computer science*, pages 765–774. IEEE, 2010.
- [73] Yaron Singer and Manas Mittal. Pricing mechanisms for crowdsourcing markets. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 1157–1166, 2013.
- [74] Maxim Sviridenko, Jan Vondrák, and Justin Ward. Optimal approximation for submodular and supermodular optimization with bounded curvature. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 42(4): 1197–1218, 2017.
- [75] Kunal Talwar. The price of truth: Frugality in truthful mechanisms. In *Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, pages 608–619. Springer, 2003.
- [76] Shaojie Tang and Jing Yuan. Adaptive regularized submodular maximization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.00384*, 2021.
- [77] Shaojie Tang and Jing Yuan. Submodular optimization beyond nonnegativity: Adaptive seed selection in incentivized social advertising. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.15180*, 2021.
- [78] William Vickrey. Counterspeculation, auctions, and competitive sealed tenders. *The Journal of Finance*, 16(1):8–37, 1961.
- [79] Yijing Wang, Dachuan Xu, Donglei Du, and Ran Ma. Online bicriteria algorithms to balance coverage and cost in team formation. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Applications in Management*, pages 25–36. Springer, 2020.
- [80] Yijing Wang, Yicheng Xu, and Xiaoguang Yang. On maximizing the difference between an approximately submodular function and a linear function subject to a matroid constraint. In *International Conference on Combinatorial Optimization and Applications*, pages 75–85. Springer, 2021.

A Related Work

Gains From Trades vs. Utilitarian Objectives. The objective we study in this work has connections to gains-from-trade in two-sided market. The seminal work of Myerson and Satterthwaite [61] showed that even when there is one seller and one buyer there is no mechanism that satisfies IR, Bayesian IC (BIC), Budget-Balance, and can extract the full gains-from-trade (GFT), i.e., the total value generated by transferring the items from the sellers to the buyers. In light of that result, a lot of works have focused on relaxing one of these desiderata. Of particular interest are the works that are seeking an *approximately* optimal solution to the GFT objective. In the case of one buyer and one seller, McAfee [57] provided an elegant mechanism that achieves a $1/2$ -approximation guarantee if the median of the buyer’s value is higher than that of the seller’s. In a similar spirit, Blumrosen and Mizrahi [10] proposed a $1/e$ -approximation for this problem, when both the buyer and the seller satisfy the monotone-hazard-rate (MHR) condition. Recently, Brustle et al. [11] provided a simple mechanism that gives a $1/2$ -approximation to GFT under arbitrary distributions. Subsequently, Deng et al. [24] provided a constant approximation to the *first-best* objective, i.e., the GFT that can be achieved if the agents are not strategic, resolving a long-standing open question; and Fei [29] improves the approximation factor to 3.15. Cai et al. [17] moved beyond the setting with one seller, providing approximations algorithms in environments with multiple sellers. A different line of work in the two-sided markets literature has focused on the utilitarian objective, i.e., the total value of the buyers for the items that the purchased and the total cost of the sellers who did not sell their items. Lehmann et al. [53] gave a greedy algorithm for this objective that gives a $1/2$ -approximation, and Fu et al. [35] implemented it as an ascending auction that gives the same approximation, when the buyers are not strategic. More recently, Blumrosen and Dobzinski [9] designed a simple take-it-or-leave-it mechanism for this objective that achieves a $(1 - 1/e)$ -approximation. Colini-Baldeschi et al. [22] designed a constant-factor approximation mechanism that satisfies the Strongly Budget Balanced condition, meaning that all the payments of the buyers are transferred to the sellers. Subsequently, Colini-Baldeschi et al. [23] developed a constant-factor approximation mechanism in the setting with XOS valuations.

Budget-feasible Mechanism Design. The study of budget-feasible mechanism design, with an emphasis on procurement auctions, was put forth by the seminal work on Singer [72] who provided a prior-free² budget-feasible mechanism that enjoys a constant approximation when the objective is a *non-negative* and monotone submodular function. Since then, a long line of work has studied this problem providing better approximation guarantees, relaxing the monotonicity constraint on the objective function and extending the results to even more general classes of functions including XOS and subadditive functions [26, 20, 2, 7, 46, 1, 4, 40]. Currently, the best approximation guarantees for monotone submodular functions are obtained by Han et al. [40], that achieve an approximation factor of 4.3. It is worth highlighting that, to the best of our knowledge, none of these works have studied *non-positive* submodular functions.

Reduction from Algorithm Design to Mechanism Design. Our results contribute to the rich literature of transformations from *algorithms* that operate on non-strategic data to *mechanisms* whose input is coming from strategic agents. A striking result by Chawla et al. [19] showed that there is no welfare-preserving black-box reduction when the mechanism is required to be truthful in expectation. Since then, a beautiful line of work initiated by Hartline and Lucier [43] develops mechanisms that satisfy the weaker Bayesian Incentive Compatibility (BIC) condition, instead of truthfulness in expectation. An important tool that all these works [43, 5, 42, 44, 27] utilize to establish the (approximate) BIC property is a *replica-to-surrogate* matching. It is worth highlighting that Dughmi et al. [27] managed to obtain an *exactly* BIC mechanism, by introducing novel constructions in the context of mechanism design, such as various *Bernoulli factories*. In the context of multidimensional revenue maximization, Cai et al. [14, 13, 15, 16] developed black-box transformations from algorithms to (approximately) revenue-optimal and (approximately) BIC mechanisms

²This means that the auctioneer does not have any prior information about the private types of the sellers.

Submodular Optimization. The problem of submodular maximization has received a lot of attention in the optimization literature. The seminal work of Nemhauser et al. [62] shows that the natural greedy algorithm gives an $(1 - 1/e)$ -approximation to the optimal solution when the submodular function is *monotone* and *non-negative*. Later, Feige et al. [32] designed algorithms that provide constant approximation guarantees when the underlying function is *non-negative*, but, potentially, non-monotone. Designing approximation algorithms with constant-factor approximation guarantees for general non-positive submodular functions is known to be hard [68, 31]. The study of the objective $f(S) - c(S)$, where f is a non-negative submodular function and c is a linear function, is commonly referred to as *regularized submodular optimization*. This line of work was initiated by Sviridenko et al. [74] who designed an algorithm that obtains a $(1 - 1/e)f(\text{OPT}) - c(\text{OPT})$ and showed that this guarantee is optimal. Later, Feldman [34] and Harshaw et al. [41] designed simpler and more computationally efficient algorithms that attain the same approximation guarantees. Since then, there has been a long line of work studying that problem and designing algorithms that work in the centralized setting, the distributed setting, the streaming setting, and the online setting [49, 79, 80, 47, 59, 63, 37, 76, 77, 36, 55, 69, 56, 38]. It is worth noting that the design of approximation algorithms for bi-criteria objectives has also been considered in different contexts in the past [52, 30, 33].

B Omitted Details from Section 3

Table 1: Instantiations of Algorithm 2 with different submodular optimization algorithms.

<u>Algorithm</u>	<u>Approximation Guarantee</u>
Greedy-margin [52]	No Worst-Case Guarantee
Greedy-rate [33]	Parametrized Guarantee
Distorted Greedy [41] & (this paper)	$(1 - e^{-\beta}) \cdot f(\text{OPT}) - (\beta + o(1)) \cdot c(\text{OPT})$ for all $\beta \in [0, 1]$
Stochastic Distorted Greedy [41] & (this paper)	$(1 - e^{-\beta}) \cdot f(\text{OPT}) - (\beta + o(1)) \cdot c(\text{OPT})$ for all $\beta \in [0, 1]$ (in expectation)
ROI Greedy (same as Greedy-rate) [47]	$f(\text{OPT}) - \left(1 + \ln \frac{f(\text{OPT})}{c(\text{OPT})}\right) \cdot c(\text{OPT})$
Cost-scaled Greedy [63]	$1/2 \cdot f(\text{OPT}) - c(\text{OPT})$ (online and adversarial)

B.1 Deterministic Distorted Greedy Algorithm Analysis

In this section we extend the results of [41] that obtain a $(1 - e^{-1}, 1)$ bi-criteria approximation guarantee to $(1 - e^{-\beta}, \beta)$ guarantee, where $\beta \in [0, 1]$. First, we recall a negative result from [34].

Theorem B.1 ([34]). *For every $\beta \in [0, 1], \varepsilon > 0$, no polynomial-time algorithm can guarantee $(1 - e^{-\beta} + \varepsilon, \beta)$ -bi-criteria approximation for the problem $\max_S (f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} c_i)$.*

We underline that Feldman [34] proposes an algorithm that achieves an (almost) matching upper bound, however the algorithm works using the continuous multilinear extension of the underlying function, which is quite non-practical and does not fit our mechanism design framework. We propose an approach based on the distorted greedy algorithm of [41] that achieves this guarantee for every $\beta \in [0, 1]$. Formally, we prove the result stated in Theorem 3.1.

ALGORITHM 6: Distorted greedy algorithm [41]

Data: A set of n items \mathcal{N} , a monotone submodular function $f : 2^{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, a cost function $c : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, a capacity constraint $k \leq n$

Result: A subset of the items $R \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ with $|R| \leq k$

```

1  $S_0 = \emptyset$ ;
2 for  $j$  from 1 to  $k$  do
3    $G(i, S_{j-1}, \mathbf{c}, j, r) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{k-j} \cdot f(i \mid S_{j-1}) - c_i, \forall i \in S$ ;
4    $i_t = \arg \max_{i \notin S_{j-1}} G(i, S_{j-1}, \mathbf{c}, j, r)$ ;
5   if  $G(i_t, S_{j-1}, \mathbf{c}, j, r) > 0$  then
6      $S_j = S_{j-1} \cup \{i_t\}$ ;
7   end
8   else
9      $S_j = S_{j-1}$ ;
10  end
11 end
12 return  $S_n$ ;

```

We reiterate that Theorem 3.1 improves upon the guarantees stated in [41] since it achieves optimal bi-criteria guarantee simultaneously for all $\beta \in [0, 1]$. Following [41], we define the following functions

$$\Phi_t(T) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-t} f(T) - \sum_{j \in T} c_j, \quad \forall T \subseteq \mathcal{N},$$

$$\Psi_t(T, i) = \max \left\{ 0, \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(i|T) - c_i \right\}, \quad \forall T \subseteq \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{N}.$$

The next result from [41] describes the connection between these two quantities.

Lemma B.2 ([41]). *In each iteration $t \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ of Algorithm 6 it holds that*

$$\Phi_{t+1}(S_{t+1}) - \Phi_t(S_t) = \Psi_t(S_t, i_t) + \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(S_t).$$

The next result of [41] relates the marginal gain in each iteration of Algorithm 6 to the function $\Psi_t(S_t, i_t)$.

Lemma B.3 ([41]). *In each iteration of Algorithm 6 it holds that*

$$\Psi_t(S_t, i_t) \geq \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} (f(\text{OPT}) - f(S_t)) - \frac{1}{k} c(\text{OPT})$$

Finally, we will make use of the following simple technical result.

Proposition B.4. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}, \beta \in [0, 1]$ it holds that*

$$\frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{x \cdot n}}{1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)} \geq 1 - e^{-x}.$$

Proof. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{x \cdot n}}{1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)} &= 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{x \cdot n} && \text{(Simplify denominator)} \\ &\geq 1 - e^{-\frac{x \cdot n}{n}}. && (1 - x \leq e^{-x}) \end{aligned}$$

□

Equipped with the previous results, we are ready to prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. By definition of $\Phi_0(\cdot), \Phi_k(\cdot)$ we have that

$$\Phi_0(S_0) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) \cdot f(\emptyset) - c(\emptyset) = 0,$$

and

$$\Phi_k(S_k) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^0 \cdot f(S_k) - c(S_k) = f(S_k) - c(S_k).$$

Notice that $\Phi_k(S_k) - \Phi_0(S_0) = \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \Phi_{t+1}(S_{t+1}) - \Phi_t(S_t)$. By Lemma B.2 it follows immediately that $\Phi_{t+1}(S_{t+1}) - \Phi_t(S_t) \geq 0$. Moreover, by Lemma B.2 and Lemma B.3 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{t+1}(S_{t+1}) - \Phi_t(S_t) &= \Psi_t(S_t, i_t) + \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(S_t) && \text{(Lemma B.2)} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} (f(\text{OPT}) - f(S_t)) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{k} c(\text{OPT}) + \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(S_t) && \text{(Lemma B.3)} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(\text{OPT}) - \frac{1}{k} c(\text{OPT}) && \text{(Rearranging terms)} \end{aligned}$$

First, assume that β is a multiple of $1/k$. We lower bound the first $k - \beta \cdot k$ terms of $\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \Phi_{t+1}(S_{t+1}) - \Phi_t(S_t)$ by 0 and the last $\beta \cdot k$ terms by the previous inequality. Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \Phi_{t+1}(S_{t+1}) - \Phi_t(S_t) &\geq \sum_{t=k-\beta \cdot k}^{k-1} \Phi_{t+1}(S_{t+1}) - \Phi_t(S_t) \\ &\geq \sum_{t=k-\beta \cdot k}^{k-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(\text{OPT}) - \frac{1}{k} c(\text{OPT}) \right\} \\ &= \left(\sum_{t=k-\beta \cdot k}^{k-1} \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} \right) f(\text{OPT}) - \beta \cdot c(\text{OPT}) \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \cdot \frac{1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{\beta \cdot k}}{1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)} \cdot f(\text{OPT}) - \beta \cdot c(\text{OPT}) && \text{(Sum of geometric series)} \\ &\geq (1 - e^{-\beta}) \cdot f(\text{OPT}) - \beta \cdot c(\text{OPT}). && \text{(Proposition B.4)} \end{aligned}$$

In case β is not a multiple of $1/k$, the same analysis goes through with $\hat{\beta}$ being the smallest multiple of $1/k$ that is greater than β and the guarantee we get is $(1 - e^{-\hat{\beta}}, \hat{\beta})$, which is at least $(1 - e^{-\beta}, \beta + 1/k)$. \square

B.2 Stochastic Distorted Greedy Algorithm Analysis

In this section we shift our attention to the stochastic version of the distorted greedy algorithm [41], which requires fewer oracle calls to the function $f(\cdot)$ than its deterministic counterpart.

We first state some results from Harshaw et al. [41] that will be useful in our analysis.

Lemma B.5 ([41]). *In each step t of Algorithm 7 it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}[\Psi_t(S_t, i_t)] \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \left(\frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} (f(\text{OPT}) - \mathbb{E}[f(S_t)]) - \frac{1}{k} c(\text{OPT}) \right)$$

Notice also that we have the trivial lower bound $\mathbb{E}[\Psi_t(S_t, i_t)] \geq 0$. We are now ready to state and prove our main result in this subsection.

ALGORITHM 7: Stochastic distorted greedy algorithm [41]

Data: A set of n items \mathcal{N} , a monotone submodular function $f : 2^{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, a cost function $c : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, a capacity constraint $k \leq n$, an error parameter $\varepsilon > 0$

Result: A subset of the items $R \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ with $|R| \leq k$

```

1  $S_0 = \emptyset$ ;
2  $s = \lceil \frac{n}{k} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rceil$ ;
3 for  $j$  from 1 to  $k$  do
4    $B_j =$  sample  $s$  elements uniformly and independently from  $\Omega$ ;
5    $G(i, S_{j-1}, \mathbf{c}, j, r) = (1 - \frac{1}{n})^{k-j} \cdot f(i \mid S_{j-1}) - c_i, \forall i \in B_j$ ;
6    $i_t = \arg \max_{i \notin S_{j-1}, i \in B_j} G(i, S_{j-1}, \mathbf{c}, j, r)$ ;
7   if  $G(i^*, S_{j-1}, \mathbf{c}, j, r) > 0$  then
8      $S_j = S_{j-1} \cup \{i^*\}$ ;
9   end
10  else
11     $S_j = S_{j-1}$ ;
12  end
13 end
14 return  $S_n$ ;

```

Theorem B.6. Let \mathcal{N} be a universe of n elements, $f : 2^{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a monotone submodular function and $c : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a cost function. Let OPT be the optimal solution of the objective $\max_{S \subseteq \mathcal{N}, |S| \leq k} \{f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} c_i\}$. Then, the output R of Algorithm 7 satisfies $\mathbb{E} \left[f(R) - \sum_{j \in R} c_j \right] \geq (1 - \varepsilon)(1 - e^{-\beta})f(\text{OPT}) - (\beta + 1/k) \sum_{j \in \text{OPT}} c_j$, simultaneously for all $\beta \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. By definition of $\Phi_0(\cdot), \Phi_k(\cdot)$ we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[\Phi_0(S_0)] = \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) \cdot f(\emptyset) - c(\emptyset) = 0,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\Phi_k(S_k)] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^0 \cdot f(S_k) - c(S_k) \right] = \mathbb{E} [f(S_k) - c(S_k)].$$

Notice that, by linearity of expectation, $\mathbb{E}[\Phi_k(S_k) - \Phi_0(S_0)] = \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}[\Phi_{t+1}(S_{t+1}) - \Phi_t(S_t)]$. By definition of Ψ_{t+1} it follows immediately that $\mathbb{E}[\Phi_{t+1}(S_{t+1}) - \Phi_t(S_t)] \geq 0$.³ Moreover, by Lemma B.2 and Lemma B.5 we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\Phi_{t+1}(S_{t+1}) - \Phi_t(S_t)] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\Psi_t(S_t, i_t) + \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(S_t) \right] \quad (\text{Lemma B.2 and linearity of expectation}) \\
&\geq (1 - \varepsilon) \left(\frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} (f(\text{OPT}) - \mathbb{E}[f(S_t)]) - \frac{1}{k} c(\text{OPT}) \right) + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} \mathbb{E}[f(S_t)] \quad (\text{Lemma B.3}) \\
&\geq (1 - \varepsilon) \left(\frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(\text{OPT}) - \frac{1}{k} c(\text{OPT}) \right) + \\
&\quad \frac{\varepsilon}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} \mathbb{E}[f(S_t)] \quad (\text{Rearranging terms}) \\
&\geq (1 - \varepsilon) \left(\frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(\text{OPT}) - \frac{1}{k} c(\text{OPT}) \right) \quad (\text{Non-negativity of } f)
\end{aligned}$$

³In fact, it holds for the realization of the random variables and not just in expectation.

First, assume that β is a multiple of $1/k$. We lower bound the first $k - \beta \cdot k$ terms of $\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}[\Phi_{t+1}(S_{t+1}) - \Phi_t(S_t)]$ by 0 and the last $\beta \cdot k$ terms by the previous inequality. Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}[\Phi_{t+1}(S_{t+1}) - \Phi_t(S_t)] &\geq \sum_{t=k-\beta \cdot k}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}[\Phi_{t+1}(S_{t+1}) - \Phi_t(S_t)] \\
&\geq \sum_{t=k-\beta \cdot k}^{k-1} (1-\varepsilon) \left\{ \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(\text{OPT}) - \frac{1}{k} c(\text{OPT}) \right\} \\
&\geq (1-\varepsilon) \left(\sum_{t=k-\beta \cdot k}^{k-1} \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} \right) f(\text{OPT}) - \beta \cdot c(\text{OPT}) \quad (\text{Non-negativity of } c) \\
&= \frac{1-\varepsilon}{k} \cdot \frac{1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{\beta \cdot k}}{1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)} \cdot f(\text{OPT}) - \beta \cdot c(\text{OPT}) \quad (\text{Sum of geometric series}) \\
&\geq (1-\varepsilon)(1 - e^{-\beta}) \cdot f(\text{OPT}) - \beta \cdot c(\text{OPT}). \quad (\text{Proposition B.4})
\end{aligned}$$

In case β is not a multiple of $1/k$, the same analysis goes through with $\hat{\beta}$ being the smallest multiple of $1/k$ that is greater than β and the guarantee we get is $((1-\varepsilon)(1 - e^{-\hat{\beta}}), \hat{\beta})$, which is at least $((1-\varepsilon)(1 - e^{-\beta}), \beta + 1/k)$. \square

B.3 Noisy Setting

Following the model of Horel and Singer [45], in this section we discuss adaptations of our results to the noisy setting where we have access to an oracle $F : 2^{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ so that

$$(1-\varepsilon)f(S) \leq F(S) \leq (1+\varepsilon)f(S), \forall S \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{N}},$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Our Algorithm 8 is an adaptation of Harshaw et al. [41] and Gong et al. [38] with the main difference being that when we evaluate the score of an element we look at its minimum marginal contribution across all the sets we have constructed in the history of the execution. This is because the function F is not submodular.

Similarly as in the noiseless setting, we let

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\Phi}_t(T) &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-t} F(T) - x \cdot \sum_{j \in T} c_j, \quad \forall T \subseteq \mathcal{N}, \\
\tilde{\Psi}_t(\mathcal{T}, i) &= \max \left\{ 0, \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} \min_{S \in \mathcal{T}} F(i|S) - x \cdot c_i \right\}, \quad \forall \mathcal{T} \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{N}}, i \in \mathcal{N}.
\end{aligned}$$

The next result describes the connection between $\tilde{\Phi}, \tilde{\Psi}$. Our proof is an adaptation of Harshaw et al. [41], Gong et al. [38].

Lemma B.7. *In each iteration $t \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ of Algorithm 8 it holds that*

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{t+1}(S_{t+1}) - \tilde{\Phi}_t(S_t) \geq \tilde{\Psi}_t(\mathcal{S}_t, i_t) + \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} F(S_t),$$

where $\mathcal{S}_t = \{S_0, \dots, S_t\}$.

Proof. By definition we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\Phi}_{t+1}(S_{t+1}) - \tilde{\Phi}_t(S_t) &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} F(S_{t+1}) - c(S_{t+1}) - \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-t} F(S_t) - c(S_t) \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} F(S_{t+1}) - c(S_{t+1}) - \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) F(S_t) - c(S_t)
\end{aligned}$$

ALGORITHM 8: Noisy distorted greedy algorithm

Data: A set of n items \mathcal{N} , a monotone submodular function $f : 2^{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, a cost function $c : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, a capacity constraint $k \leq n$, a cost parameter x

Result: A subset of the items $R \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ with $|R| \leq k$

```

1  $S_0 = \emptyset$ ;
2  $\mathcal{S}_0 = S_0$ ;
3 for  $j$  from 1 to  $k$  do
4    $G(i, S_{j-1}, \mathbf{c}, j, r) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{k-j} \cdot \min_{1 \leq t \leq j} F(i | S_{t-1}) - x \cdot c_i, \forall i \in S$ ;
5    $i^* = \arg \max_{i \notin S_{j-1}} G(i, S_{j-1}, \mathbf{c}, j, r)$ ;
6   if  $G(i^*, S_{j-1}, \mathbf{c}, j, r) > 0$  then
7      $S_j = S_{j-1} \cup \{i^*\}$ ;
8      $\mathcal{S}_j = \mathcal{S}_{j-1} \cup S_j$ ;
9   end
10  else
11     $S_j = S_{j-1}$ ;
12     $\mathcal{S}_j = \mathcal{S}_{j-1}$ ;
13  end
14 end
15 return  $S_n$ ;

```

$$= \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} (F(S_{t+1}) - F(S_t)) - (c(S_{t+1}) - c(S_t)) + \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} F(S_t).$$

Now we consider two cases. If $S_{t+1} = S_t$ then $\tilde{\Psi}(S_t, i_t) = 0$ and the inequality holds. Otherwise, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} (F(S_{t+1}) - F(S_t)) - (c(S_{t+1}) - c(S_t)) + \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} F(S_t) &= \\ \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} F(i_t | S_t) - c_{i_t} + \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} F(S_t) &\geq \\ \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} \min_{1 \leq j \leq t} F(i_t | S_j) - c_{i_t} + \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} F(S_t) &= \\ \tilde{\Psi}_t(S_t, i_t) + \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} F(S_t). & \end{aligned}$$

□

The next result relates the marginal gain in each iteration of Algorithm 8 to the function $\tilde{\Psi}_t(S_t, i_t)$. It builds upon the approach of Harshaw et al. [41], Gong et al. [38].

Lemma B.8. *In each iteration of Algorithm 8 it holds that*

$$\tilde{\Psi}_t(S_t, i_t) \geq \frac{1-\varepsilon}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} (f(\text{OPT}) - f(S_t)) - 2\varepsilon \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(S_k) - \frac{x}{k} c(\text{OPT}).$$

Proof. First, notice that

$$F(S|i) = F(S \cup \{i\}) - F(S) \geq (1-\varepsilon)f(S \cup \{i\}) - (1+\varepsilon)f(S) = (1-\varepsilon)f(S|i) - 2\varepsilon f(S). \quad (1)$$

Let OPT be the optimal solution of $\max_S \{f(S) - c(S)\}$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} k\tilde{\Psi}_t(S_t, i_t) &= k \cdot \max \left\{ 0, \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} \min_{S \in \mathcal{S}_t} F(i_t | S) - x \cdot c_i \right\} && \text{(Definition)} \\ &\geq k \cdot \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} \min_{S \in \mathcal{S}_t} F(i_t | S) - x \cdot c_i \right) && \text{(Restricting max)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= k \cdot \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} \min_{S \in \mathcal{S}_t} F(i|S) - x \cdot c_i \right\} && \text{(Definition)} \\
&\geq |\text{OPT}| \cdot \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} \min_{S \in \mathcal{S}_t} F(i|S) - x \cdot c_i \right\} && (k \geq |\text{OPT}|) \\
&\geq |\text{OPT}| \cdot \max_{i \in \text{OPT}} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} \min_{S \in \mathcal{S}_t} F(i|S) - x \cdot c_i \right\} && \text{(Restricting max)} \\
&\geq \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} \min_{S \in \mathcal{S}_t} F(i|S) - x \cdot c_i \right\} && \text{(Averaging argument)} \\
&= \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} F(i|S^i) - x \cdot c_i \right\} && (S^i = \arg \min_{S \in \mathcal{S}_t} F(i|S)) \\
&\geq \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} ((1 - \varepsilon)f(i|S^i) - 2\varepsilon f(S^i)) - x \cdot c_i \right\} && \text{(Equation (1))} \\
&\geq \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} ((1 - \varepsilon)f(i|S_t) - 2\varepsilon f(S^i)) - x \cdot c_i \right\} && \text{(Submodularity of } f) \\
&\geq \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} (1 - \varepsilon)f(i|S_t) - 2\varepsilon \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(S_k) - x \cdot c_i \right\}. && \text{(Monotonicity of } f)
\end{aligned}$$

We will bound each term of the summation separately. Notice that $\sum_{i \in \text{OPT}} x \cdot c_i = x \cdot c(\text{OPT})$. Similarly, $\sum_{i \in \text{OPT}} 2\varepsilon \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(S_k) \leq 2\varepsilon |\text{OPT}| f(S_k) \leq 2\varepsilon k f(S_k)$, and by the submodularity and monotonicity of f we have

$$\sum_{i \in \text{OPT}} (1 - \varepsilon)f(i|S_t) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)(f(S_t \cup \text{OPT}) - f(S_t)) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)(f(\text{OPT}) - f(S_t)).$$

Putting everything together, we get

$$k\tilde{\Psi}_t(\mathcal{S}_t, i_t) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} (f(\text{OPT}) - f(S_t)) - 2\varepsilon k \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(S_k) - xc(\text{OPT}),$$

and dividing by k we get

$$\tilde{\Psi}_t(\mathcal{S}_t, i_t) \geq \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} (f(\text{OPT}) - f(S_t)) - 2\varepsilon \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(S_k) - \frac{x}{k}c(\text{OPT}).$$

□

We are now ready to prove the bi-criteria guarantees of Algorithm 8. Our analysis follows Harshaw et al. [41], Gong et al. [38].

Theorem B.9. *For $x = 1 + 2\varepsilon k + \varepsilon$ Algorithm 8 returns a set S_k with*

$$f(S_k) - c(S_k) \geq \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{1 + 2\varepsilon k + \varepsilon} \cdot (1 - 1/e) f(\text{OPT}) - c(S_k).$$

Proof. Combining Lemma B.7 and Lemma B.8 we immediately get that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\Phi}_{t+1}(\mathcal{S}_{t+1}) - \tilde{\Phi}_t(\mathcal{S}_t) \geq \\
&\tilde{\Psi}_t(\mathcal{S}_t, i_t) + \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} F(\mathcal{S}_t) \geq \\
&\frac{1 - \varepsilon}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} (f(\text{OPT}) - f(S_t)) - 2\varepsilon \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(S_k) - \frac{x}{k}c(\text{OPT}) + \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} F(\mathcal{S}_t) \geq
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1-\varepsilon}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} (f(\text{OPT}) - f(S_t)) - 2\varepsilon \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(S_k) - \frac{x}{k} c(\text{OPT}) + \frac{1-\varepsilon}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(S_t) = \\ & \frac{1-\varepsilon}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(\text{OPT}) - 2\varepsilon \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(S_k) - \frac{x}{k} c(\text{OPT}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, notice that a straightforward bound is

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{t+1}(S_{t+1}) - \tilde{\Phi}_t(S_t) \geq 0.$$

By definition of $\tilde{\Phi}$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Phi}_0(S_0) &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^k F(\emptyset) - xc(\emptyset) = 0 \\ \tilde{\Phi}_k(S_k) &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^k F(S_k) - xc(S_k). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the previous inequalities we get

$$\begin{aligned} & F(S_k) - xc(S_k) \\ &= \tilde{\Phi}_k(S_k) - \tilde{\Phi}_0(S_0) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k (\tilde{\Phi}_i(S_i) - \tilde{\Phi}_{i-1}(S_{i-1})) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(\text{OPT}) - 2\varepsilon \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(S_k) - \frac{x}{k} c(\text{OPT}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1-\varepsilon}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(\text{OPT}) - 2\varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^k \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-(t+1)} f(S_k) - x \cdot c(\text{OPT}) \\ &= \frac{1-\varepsilon}{k} \cdot k \cdot \left(1 - (1 - 1/k)^k\right) f(\text{OPT}) - 2\varepsilon k \cdot \left(1 - (1 - 1/k)^k\right) f(S_k) - x \cdot c(\text{OPT}), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \varepsilon)f(S_k) - xc(S_k) &\geq (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \left(1 - (1 - 1/k)^k\right) f(\text{OPT}) - 2\varepsilon k \cdot \left(1 - (1 - 1/k)^k\right) f(S_k) - xc(\text{OPT}) \\ &\geq (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \left(1 - (1 - 1/k)^k\right) f(\text{OPT}) - 2\varepsilon k \cdot f(S_k) - xc(\text{OPT}), \end{aligned}$$

and rearranging we get

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + 2\varepsilon k + \varepsilon)f(S_k) - xc(S_k) &\geq (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \left(1 - (1 - 1/k)^k\right) f(\text{OPT}) - xc(\text{OPT}) \\ &\geq (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot (1 - 1/e) f(\text{OPT}) - xc(\text{OPT}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we can simplify $x = 1 + 2\varepsilon k + \varepsilon$ and get

$$f(S_k) - c(S_k) \geq \frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+2\varepsilon k+\varepsilon} \cdot (1-1/e) f(\text{OPT}) - c(S_k).$$

□

Remark B.10 (IC, IR, NAS in the Noisy Setting). *We remark that our modification in Algorithm 8 enforces the diminishing returns property in the scores of the elements that are added to the constructed solutions. Hence, an identical argument to the one we used in the proof of Theorem 4.3 shows that the NAS property is satisfied. The IC, IR properties continue to hold since they are not affected by the submodularity of the function.*

C Omitted Details from Section 4

Let $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b}) \in \arg \max_{S \in 2^{\mathcal{N}}} f(S) - \sum_{i \in S} c_i$. Given a bid profile \mathbf{b} , the VCG mechanism purchases items from the sellers in $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})$ and the payment p_i to each $i \in \text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})$ is given by

$$p_i = \left(f(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})) - \sum_{j \in \text{OPT}(\mathbf{b}) \setminus \{i\}} c_j \right) - \left(f(\text{OPT}((\infty, \mathbf{b}_{-i}))) - \sum_{j \in \text{OPT}((\infty, \mathbf{b}_{-i}))} c_j \right).$$

Proof of Proposition 4.1. We would like to show $f(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})) \geq \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})} p_i$ when f is a submodular function.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})} p_i &= \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})} \left(f(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})) - \sum_{j \in \text{OPT}(\mathbf{b}) \setminus \{i\}} c_j \right) - \left(f(\text{OPT}((\infty, \mathbf{b}_{-i}))) - \sum_{j \in \text{OPT}((\infty, \mathbf{b}_{-i}))} c_j \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})} \left(f(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})) - \sum_{j \in \text{OPT}(\mathbf{b}) \setminus \{i\}} c_j \right) - \left(f(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b}) \setminus \{i\}) - \sum_{j \in \text{OPT}(\mathbf{b}) \setminus \{i\}} c_j \right) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})} f(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})) - f(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b}) \setminus \{i\}) \\ &\leq f(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality uses the fact that $\text{OPT}((\infty, \mathbf{b}_{-i})) \in \arg \max_{S: i \notin S} f(S) - \sum_{j \in S} c_j$ and the second inequality follows the property of submodularity. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Fix \mathbf{b}_{-i} and r , and let $\{S_0^{b_i}, S_1^{b_i}, \dots, S_n^{b_i}\}$ be the intermediate tentative solutions of running $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{N}, (b_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}), r)$. Moreover, let $p_{i,k} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} z_j^*$ where

$$z_j^* = \sup \left\{ z \mid i = \arg \max_{\ell \notin S_{j-1}^\infty} G(\ell, S_{j-1}^\infty, (z, \mathbf{b}_{-i}), j, r) \ \& \ G(i, S_{j-1}^\infty, (z, \mathbf{b}_{-i}), j, r) > 0 \right\}.$$

We will show that for any i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}, r , and k : (1) if $b_i < p_{i,k}$, $i \in S_k^{b_i}$, and if $b_i > p_{i,k}$, $i \notin S_k^{b_i}$; (2) if $i \notin S_k^{b_i}$, $S_k^{b_i} = S_k^\infty$. We prove it by induction on k . When $k = 1$, from Algorithm 1, the definition of $p_{i,1}$, and Assumption 4.2(1), we have

- when $b_i < p_{i,1}$, then $S_1^{b_i} = \{i\}$ since $i = \arg \max_{\ell} G(\ell, \emptyset, (b_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}), 1, r)$;
- when $b_i > p_{i,1}$, with $\ell_1^* = \arg \max_{\ell \neq i} G(\ell, \emptyset, (b_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}), 1, r)$, if $G(\ell, \emptyset, (b_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}), 1, r) > 0$, $S_1^{b_i} = \{\ell_1^*\}$; otherwise, $S_1^{b_i} = \emptyset$.

Moreover, notice that whenever $i \neq \ell_1^*$, i 's bid becomes irrelevant due to Assumption 4.2(3) so that

$$\ell_1^* = \arg \max_{\ell} G(\ell, \emptyset, (\infty, \mathbf{b}_{-i}), 1, r),$$

and therefore, if $i \notin S_1^{b_i}$, $S_1^{b_i} = S_1^\infty$. For the inductive step, we assume the previous arguments hold for all rounds up to k . Then, for round $k+1$, we have

- when $b_i < p_{i,k+1}$, then either we have $i \in S_k^{b_i} \subset S_{k+1}^{b_i}$ or we have $S_k^{b_i} = S_k^\infty$, which also implies $i \in S_{k+1}^{b_i}$ since $i = \arg \max_{\ell \notin S_k^\infty} G(\ell, S_k^\infty, (b_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}), k+1, r)$ and $G(i, S_k^\infty, (b_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}), k+1, r) > 0$;
- when $b_i > p_{i,k+1}$, with $\ell_{k+1}^* = \arg \max_{\ell \neq i} G(\ell, S_k^\infty, (b_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}), k+1, r)$, if $G(\ell_{k+1}^*, S_k^\infty, (b_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}), k+1, r) > 0$, $S_{k+1}^{b_i} = S_k^\infty \cup \{\ell_{k+1}^*\}$; otherwise, $S_{k+1}^{b_i} = S_k^\infty$.

Again, notice that whenever $i \neq \ell_{k+1}^*$, i 's bid becomes irrelevant due to Assumption 4.2(3) so that

$$\ell_{k+1}^* = \arg \max_{\ell \notin S_k^\infty} G(i, S_k^\infty, (\infty, \mathbf{b}_{-i}), k+1, r);$$

and therefore, if $i \notin S_{k+1}^{b_i}$, $S_{k+1}^{b_i} = S_{k+1}^\infty$, which concludes the inductive step. Observe that Algorithm 2 exactly computes the critical bid $p_i = p_{i,n}$ for seller i such that if $b_i < p_{i,n}$, $i \in S^*$ and if $b_i > p_{i,n}$, $i \notin S^*$. From Myerson's lemma [60], the mechanism is IC for seller i . Moreover, the mechanism is IR because $i \in S^*$ only if $c_i = b_i \leq p_{i,n}$ when seller i reports truthfully.

Finally, to prove the mechanism satisfies NAS, assume seller i is added to the solution in round k such that $S_k^{b_i} \setminus S_{k-1}^{b_i} = \{i\}$. From Assumption 4.2(2), we have $b_i \leq f(S_k^{b_i}) - f(S_{k-1}^{b_i})$ in order to have a positive score for i in round k . As we have established that if $b_i < p_{i,k-1}$, then $i \in S_{k-1}^{b_i}$, we have $p_{i,k-1} \leq b_i \leq f(S_k^{b_i}) - f(S_{k-1}^{b_i})$. For $j \geq k$, we have $z_j^* \leq f(i | S_{j-1}^\infty)$ due to the fact that $G(i, S_{j-1}, \mathbf{b}, j, r) < 0$ whenever $b_i > f(i | S_{j-1}^\infty)$ from Assumption 4.2(2). From the previously proved fact that if $i \notin S_{k-1}^{b_i}$, $S_{k-1}^{b_i} = S_{k-1}^\infty$, we have $S_{k-1}^{b_i} \subseteq S_{j-1}^\infty$ for $j \geq k$ by submodularity of f . As a result, for $j \geq k$, we have that

$$z_j^* \leq f(i | S_{j-1}^\infty) \leq f(i | S_{k-1}^{b_i}) = f(S_k^{b_i}) - f(S_{k-1}^{b_i}),$$

which implies that $p_i = \max \left\{ p_{i,k-1}, \max_{k \leq j \leq n} z_j^* \right\} \leq f(S_k^{b_i}) - f(S_{k-1}^{b_i})$. Thus,

$$\sum_{i \in S_n^{b_i}} p_i \leq \sum_{k=1}^n f(S_k^{b_i}) - f(S_{k-1}^{b_i}) = f(S_n^{b_i}).$$

□

C.1 Omitted Details from Online Mechanism Design Framework

Proof of Theorem 4.5. The IC and IR properties follow immediately from the fact that the mechanism is a posted-price mechanism, such that seller k accepts posted price \hat{p}_k if and only if $\hat{p}_k > c_k^4$. From the definition of \hat{p}_k and the monotonicity of G from Assumption 4.4(1), we have $G(k, S_{k-1}, \mathbf{c}_{(1,k)}, r) > 0$ if and only if $c_k < \hat{p}_k$, and therefore, Algorithm 4 and Algorithm 3 return the same solution if sellers always best respond to the posted prices.

Finally, we prove for NAS. For seller $k \in S^*$, from Assumption 4.4(2), we have

$$\hat{p}_k \leq f(k | S_{k-1}) = f(S_k) - f(S_{k-1}).$$

Thus, summing up over all sellers in S^* , we have

$$\sum_{k \in S^*} p_k \leq \sum_{k \in S^*} f(S_k) - f(S_{k-1}) = f(S^*).$$

□

D Omitted Details from Section 5

Proof of Theorem 5.1. We construct an instance with $L+2$ sellers, indexed by $\{1, \dots, L, L+1, L+2\}$, with a submodular function f such that: if $\{L+1, L+2\} \cap S = \emptyset$, $f(S) = |S|$; otherwise, $f(S) = L$. Moreover, let $b_i = 1/L$ for $i \leq L$ and $b_{L+1} = b_{L+2} = L-2$. We next describe the strategy of the adversary for selecting seller $i \in S \setminus \mathcal{D}(S, \mathbf{p})$ in line 4 of Algorithm 5.

First, the adversary keeps selecting a seller $j \in \{L+1, L+2\}$ until either $p_{L+1} < L-1$ or $p_{L+2} < L-1$. This is achievable since if $\{L+1, L+2\} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(S, \mathbf{p})$, the welfare is at most $L-2 \times (L-1) < 0$, so that the approximation guarantee is violated. Without loss of generality, assume that $p_{L+1} < L-1$, and therefore, the welfare of selecting seller $L+1$ alone is $f(\{L+1\}) - p_{L+1} > 1$.

⁴For simplicity, we assume that the seller does not accept the offer when the cost is exactly the same as the posted price.

Next, the adversary iterates over sellers from seller 1 to seller L such that for each seller i , keep selecting the seller i until i leaves the market, i.e., $p_i < b_i$. We argue that the above process is achievable as the welfare of selecting any subset containing seller i is at most 1.

The final welfare is at most 2 by purchasing items from either seller $L + 1$ or $L + 2$. However, the optimal welfare is obtained by purchasing from sellers in $\{1, \dots, L\}$, which gives welfare $L - 1$. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.2. The $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ -approximate demand oracle $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ we construct maintains a tentative solution S initialized at $S = \emptyset$. For each iteration, let i be the candidate selected by the adversary in the previous iteration. Update $S = S \cup \{i\}$ if $f(i | S) > 2p_i$ (otherwise, keep S as it is), and return S . Let S^* be the subset returned by the Algorithm 5 with demand oracle $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$. For each seller $i \in S^*$, let \hat{p}_i and S_i be the price p_i and the tentative solution S maintained by the demand oracle right before i is added to the solution, respectively. For seller $i \notin S^*$, let \hat{p}_i and S_i be the price p_i and the tentative solution S maintained by the demand oracle when i is removed from the descending auction, respectively.

Let $g(S) = f(S) - 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in S} b_i$, which is also a submodular function. For any seller $i \in \text{OPT} \setminus S^*$,

$$g(i | S^*) = f(i | S^*) - 2 \cdot b_i \leq f(i | S^*) - 2 \cdot \hat{p}_i \leq 2\varepsilon$$

where the first inequality follows $b_i - \varepsilon \leq \hat{p}_i < b_i$ for $i \notin S^*$ and the second inequality follows the fact that $f(i | S^*) \leq f(i | S_i) \leq 2 \cdot (\hat{p}_i + \varepsilon)$. As a result, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\varepsilon \cdot |\text{OPT} \setminus S^*| &\geq \sum_{i \in \text{OPT} \setminus S^*} g(i | S^*) \geq g(S^* \cup \text{OPT}) - g(S^*) \\ &= (f(S^* \cup \text{OPT}) - f(S^*)) - 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in \text{OPT} \setminus S^*} b_i \\ &\geq f(\text{OPT}) - f(S^*) - 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}} b_i, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows submodularity of g . Rearranging, we obtain

$$f(S^*) \geq f(\text{OPT}) - 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}} b_i - 2\varepsilon \cdot |\text{OPT} \setminus S^*| \geq f(\text{OPT}) - 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}} b_i - 2n\varepsilon.$$

Observe that we have

$$f(S^*) - 2 \cdot \sum_{i \in S^*} b_i = \sum_{i \in S^*} f(i | S_i) - 2 \cdot b_i \geq \sum_{i \in S^*} f(i | S_i) - 2 \cdot \hat{p}_i \geq 0,$$

where the first inequality follows $\hat{p}_i \geq b_i$ for $i \in S^*$ and the second inequality is due to $i \in S^*$ and the definition of \hat{p}_i and S_i . Therefore, we have $\sum_{i \in S^*} b_i \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot f(S^*)$, indicating $f(S^*) - \sum_{i \in S^*} b_i \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot f(S^*)$. Putting everything together, we have

$$f(S^*) - \sum_{i \in S^*} b_i \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot f(S^*) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot f(\text{OPT}) - \sum_{i \in \text{OPT}} b_i - n\varepsilon.$$

\square

E Omitted Details from Section 6

Heuristic Implementation We provide a heuristic to optimize the running time of Algorithm 1 if the scoring rule of a meta algorithm $\mathcal{A} = (G)$ has a diminishing-return structure, i.e., $G(i, S, \mathbf{b}, j, r) \geq G(i, T, \mathbf{b}, k, r)$ for all $S \subseteq T$ and $j \leq k$. In particular, inspired by the lazy implementation of the classical greedy algorithm [58], we maintain a priority queue that records each candidate's *last-updated score*. The priority queue is initialized consisting of elements with key i and value $G(i, \emptyset, \mathbf{c}, 0, r)$ for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$. For each iteration k , we repeatedly compare candidate i_1 with the highest score in Q and candidate i_2 with the second-highest score in Q . If $G(i_1, S, \mathbf{c}, k, r)$ for the tentative solution S is positive and is larger than the i_2 's score maintained in Q , then i_1 is guaranteed to have the highest score due to the diminishing-return structure; otherwise, update the score for i_1 and repeat (see Algorithm 10 in Appendix). The running time of the payment calculation in Algorithm 2 can be optimized in a similar way (see Algorithm 11 in Appendix for details). Note that the scoring rules of all deterministic algorithms presented in Table 1 have a diminishing-return structure, except for the distorted greedy algorithm.

ALGORITHM 9: Descending auction construction for a given meta algorithm \mathcal{A}^o and a step size of ε

Data: A set of seller \mathcal{N} and a bid profile \mathbf{b} from sellers

Result: A subset S^* of sellers to purchase from and a vector \mathbf{p} of payment to sellers

```
1 Generate a random seed  $r$  if needed or set  $r = 0$ ;  
2  $S_0 = \emptyset$ ;  
3 Set initial prices as  $p_i = f(i \mid \emptyset)$ ;  
4 for  $k$  from 1 to  $n$  do  
5   | Let  $\hat{p}_k$  be the unique solution of the equation  $G(k, S_{k-1}, (\mathbf{c}_{(1,k-1)}, z), r) = 0$  in terms of  $z$ ;  
6   | Update  $p_k = \hat{p}_k$ ;  
7   | if  $p_k > b_i$  then  
8   |   |  $S_k = S_{k-1} \setminus \{i\}$ ;  
9   |   | end  
10  |   | else  
11  |   |   |  $S_k = S_{k-1}$ ;  
12  |   |   |  $p_k = 0$ ;  
13  |   | end  
14 end  
15 return  $S$  and  $\mathbf{p}$ ;
```

F Faster Implementations of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2

We present the algorithmic descriptions of faster implementations of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 when the scoring rule of the meta-algorithm has a diminishing-return structure.

ALGORITHM 10: A faster implementation of Algorithm 1 when G has a diminishing-return structure

Data: A set of seller \mathcal{N} , a cost profile \mathbf{c} from sellers, and a random seed r

Result: A subset of sellers to purchase services from

```
1  $S_0 = \emptyset$ ;  
2 Initialize an empty descending-order priority queue  $Q$ ;  
3 for  $i$  from 1 to  $n$  do  
4 |   Insert an element to  $Q$  with key  $i$  and value  $G(i, \emptyset, \mathbf{c}, 0, r)$ ;  
5 end  
6 while  $k < n$  do  
7 |   Pop the highest score candidate  $i^*$  from  $Q$ ;  
8 |   while True do  
9 | |   Let the highest score from  $Q$  be  $s^*$  (without popping the candidate);  
10 | |   if  $G(i^*, S_k, \mathbf{c}, k + 1, r) > \max(0, s^*)$  or  $s^* < 0$  then  
11 | | |   Break;  
12 | |   end  
13 | |   else  
14 | | |   Pop the highest score candidate  $j^*$  from  $Q$ ;  
15 | | |   Insert an element to  $Q$  with key  $i^*$  and value  $G(i^*, S_k, \mathbf{c}, k + 1, r)$ ;  
16 | | |    $i^* = j^*$ ;  
17 | |   end  
18 |   end  
19 |   if  $G(i^*, S_k, \mathbf{c}, k + 1, r) > 0$  then  
20 | |    $S_{k+1} = S_k \cup \{i^*\}$ ;  
21 | |    $k = k + 1$ ;  
22 |   end  
23 |   else  
24 | |   break;  
25 |   end  
26 end  
27 return  $S_k$ ;
```

ALGORITHM 11: A faster implementation of Algorithm 2 when G has a diminishing-return structure

Data: A set of sellers \mathcal{N} , a bid profile \mathbf{b} from sellers, and a meta algorithm \mathcal{A}

Result: A subset of sellers to purchase from and a vector of payment to sellers

```
1 Generate a random seed  $r$  if needed or set  $r = 0$ ;  
2  $S^* = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{b}, r)$  computed using Algorithm 10 and record the intermediate solutions  $\{S_0, S_1, \dots, S_K\}$ ;  
3 for  $k$  from 1 to  $K$  do  
4    $i = S_k \setminus S_{k-1}$ ,  $T_0 = S_{k-1}$ , and  $j = 0$ ;  
5   Initialize an empty descending-order priority queue  $Q$ ;  
6   for  $i \in \mathcal{N} \setminus S_k$  do  
7     Insert an element to  $Q$  with key  $i$  and value  $G(i, S_{k-1}, \mathbf{c}, 0, r)$ ;  
8   end  
9    $p_i = b_i$ ;  
10  while  $j < n - k$  do  
11    Pop the highest score candidate  $\ell^*$  from  $Q$ ;  
12    while True do  
13      Let the highest score from  $Q$  be  $s^*$  (without popping the candidate);  
14      if  $G(\ell^*, T_j, \mathbf{c}, j + k, r) > \max(0, s^*)$  or  $s^* < 0$  then  
15        Break;  
16      end  
17      else  
18        Pop the highest score candidate  $\ell'$  from  $Q$ ;  
19        Insert an element to  $Q$  with key  $\ell^*$  and value  $G(\ell^*, T_j, \mathbf{b}, j + k, r)$ ;  
20         $\ell^* = \ell'$ ;  
21      end  
22    end  
23    if  $G(\ell^*, T_j, \mathbf{c}, j + k, r) > 0$  then  
24       $p_i = \max(p_i, \sup\{z \geq 0 \mid G(i, T_j, (z, \mathbf{b}_{-i}), j + k, r) > G(\ell^*, T_j, \mathbf{b}, j + k, r)\})$ ;  
25       $T_{j+1} = T_j \cup \{\ell^*\}$ ;  
26       $j = j + 1$ ;  
27    end  
28    else  
29      break;  
30    end  
31  end  
32 end  
33 return  $S^*$  and  $\mathbf{p}$ ;
```
