

Selling Multiple Items to a Unit-Demand Buyer via Automated Mechanism Design*

Kento Hashimoto,[†] Keita Kuwahara,[‡] and Reo Nonaka[§]

February 18, 2025

Abstract

Finding the optimal (revenue-maximizing) mechanism to sell multiple items has been a prominent and notoriously difficult open problem. Existing work has mainly focused on deriving analytical results tailored to a particular class of problems (for example, Giannakopoulos (2015) and Yang (2023)). The present paper explores the possibility of a generally applicable methodology of the Automated Mechanism Design (AMD). We first employ the deep learning algorithm developed by Dütting et al. (2023) to numerically solve small-sized problems, and the results are then generalized by educated guesswork and finally rigorously verified through duality. By focusing on a single buyer who can consume one item, our approach leads to two key contributions: establishing a much simpler way to verify the optimality of a wide range of problems and discovering a completely new result about the optimality of grand bundling. First, we show that selling each item at an identical price (or equivalently, selling the grand bundle of all items) is optimal for any number of items when the value distributions belong to a class that includes the uniform distribution as a special case. Different items are allowed to have different distributions. Second, for each number of items, we established necessary and sufficient conditions that c must satisfy for grand bundling to be optimal when the value distribution is uniform over an interval $[c, c + 1]$. This latter model does not satisfy the previously known sufficient conditions for the optimality of grand bundling Haghpanah and Hartline (2021). Our results are in contrast to the only known results for n items (for any n), Giannakopoulos (2015) and Daskalakis et al. (2017), which consider a single buyer with additive preferences, where the values of items are narrowly restricted to i.i.d. according to a uniform or exponential distribution.

1 Introduction

The optimal auction design problem is an important yet notoriously difficult open question in economic theory. It considers the revenue-maximizing selling procedure when buyers' willingness to pay is private information. The seminal work Myerson (1981) solved the problem of selling a single item, but for more than 40 years, the optimal mechanism for multiple items has not been known. Even when there is one buyer, we are yet to obtain a general result. The only known results for the one-buyer and arbitrary number of items (for any n -item) case are Giannakopoulos (2015), Daskalakis et al. (2017), Haghpanah and Hartline (2021), and Yang (2023). Giannakopoulos (2015) and Daskalakis et al. (2017) considered a buyer with additive preferences, where the value of a set of items is the sum of the values of each item and derived the optimal mechanism when the values of items are i.i.d. according to a particular distribution. Haghpanah and Hartline (2021) covers broader settings but relies on conditions that are not easy to check in practice. Similarly, Yang (2023) provides a general result, but their approach is limited to a one-dimensional type space, reducing its applicability to more complex multi-dimensional scenarios. In summary, results that apply to cases with an arbitrary number of goods are quite rare, and even when they exist, they hold only under limited settings. Furthermore, although they show sufficiency conditions for a specific mechanism to be optimal, it remains unsolved whether those conditions are also necessary. The necessary condition Haghpanah and Hartline (2021) showed is partial inverse. Although Daskalakis et al. (2017) showed a necessary and sufficient condition for grand bundling to be optimal, that condition

*We would like to thank Michihiro Kandori for his guidance and comments.

[†]The Faculty of Economics, the University of Tokyo, Japan. Email: academic.research.purpose@gmail.com

[‡]The Faculty of Economics, the University of Tokyo, Japan. Email: kuke0303@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

[§]The Graduate School of Economics, the University of Tokyo, Japan. Email: lemonnade@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

is defined by the notion of stochastic dominance and is not easy to verify.¹ A necessary and sufficient characterization in multiple goods auction theory is significantly rare and even if they exist, the condition is not easy to verify.

In contrast, we derive thus far the most general results in terms of the number of items and the range of possible value distributions and established easy-to-verify necessary and sufficient condition for the grand bundling to be optimal by focusing on a *unit-demand* buyer who can consume at most one item. We have two contributions. First, selling each item at an identical price is optimal for any number of items if the value distributions are in a class that includes the uniform distribution as a special case. Specifically, we assume that the cumulative distribution functions for the values of items $j = 1, \dots, n$ are given by $F_j(x_j) = x^{\alpha_j}$ ($\alpha_j > 0$) on the unit interval $[0,1]$, where the parameters $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ can be distinct. Note that $\alpha_j = 1$ corresponds to the uniform distribution. Moreover, different items are allowed to have different value distributions. Second, we find easy-to-verify necessary and sufficient conditions for grand bundling to be optimal when the value distribution is uniform. Suppose each item’s value distribution is uniform over $[c, c + 1]$. For any number of items, the grand bundling is optimal if and only if c is no greater than a certain threshold, which is uniquely determined according to the number of items. We succeeded in showing a necessary and sufficient characterization of the optimality.

Our results showcase the Automated Mechanism Design (AMD) approach developed in computer science (Feng et al. (2018); Conitzer and Sandholm (2002)), which is not yet well-known and appreciated by economic researchers. Mechanism design problems, in general, are constrained optimization problems, but analytical solutions are often hard to find. This comes from the complexity of incentive constraints, especially for multi-dimensional private information, and this is also true for the optimal auction problem with multiple items. The Automated Mechanism Design approach numerically solves the optimal mechanism using a computer algorithm for small-sized problems for specific parameter values, and the results obtained are generalized. We employ the deep-learning-based algorithm developed by Dütting et al. (2023), which is known to reproduce the optimal auction mechanisms in the literature. We apply it to a two-item or three-item case with uniform value distribution and obtain a candidate optimal mechanism. Using insights from that particular instance of the problem, we generalize the result and rigorously prove optimality using our duality approach.

Our basic approach is described as follows. Myerson (1981) provided an elegant procedure for deriving a simple closed form of the expected revenue from the incentive constraints. Still, this approach is challenging to extend to the multiple-item case. The difficulty comes from the fact that the private information is multi-dimensional. In ex-ante, we do not know in which direction the incentive constraints bind. In contrast, we derive the optimal mechanism by duality. As for the case where the cumulative distribution functions for the values of items $j = 1, \dots, n$ are given by $F_j(x_j) = x^{\alpha_j}$ ($\alpha_j > 0$) on the unit interval $[0,1]$, we used weak duality of the dual problem. The dual problem of revenue maximization is the art of finding the upper bounds of possible revenues, and a mechanism is guaranteed to be optimal if it hits one of the upper bounds in the dual problem. This is in line with the optimal auction design literature in computer science (Cai et al. (2016); Giannakopoulos (2015)). We derive a simple dual problem for a unit-demand buyer, and our mechanism is shown to hit an upper bound given in our dual problem. The demonstration of our duality and the optimality of our mechanism admits short, elementary, and self-contained proofs. For the case where the value distribution is uniformly distributed over $[c, c + 1]$, we utilized the strong duality of the dual problem, first established by Daskalakis et al. (2017). Daskalakis et al. (2017) demonstrated the strong duality between the optimal mechanism design problem and its dual problem in the setting where the buyer has additive preferences. Kash and Frongillo (2016) extended this strong duality framework to the case where the buyer has unit-demand preferences. We derived the solution to this dual problem and verified its feasibility. Furthermore, by fully leveraging this strong duality framework, we established the necessary conditions for grand bundling to be optimal. Combined with the sufficient conditions, these conditions provide the necessary and sufficient conditions for pure-bundling to be optimal.

1.1 Our results

In this paper, we derive the most general results regarding the number of items and the range of possible value distributions by focusing on a *unit-demand* buyer who can consume no more than one item. In Section 3, we assume that the cumulative distribution functions for the values of items $j = 1, \dots, n$ are

¹Indeed, even when the value of each item uniformly distributed over $[c, c + 1]$ independently, Daskalakis et al. (2017) only prove the sufficient condition for the grand bundling to be optimal and does not show necessary and sufficient characterization for what value of $c \geq 0$, grand bundling is optimal. In contrast, focusing on the case the buyer has unit-demand preference, we characterized that condition and that is quite easy to check.

given by $F_j(x_j) = x^{\alpha_j}$ ($\alpha_j > 0$) on the unit interval $[0, 1]$, where the parameters $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ can be distinct. We show that selling each item at an identical price (or equivalently, selling the grand bundle of all items) is optimal for any number of items:

Theorem 1. *Suppose the cumulative distribution functions for the values of items $j = 1, \dots, n$ are given by $F_j(x_j) = x^{\alpha_j}$ ($\alpha_j > 0$) on the unit interval $[0, 1]$ independently. Then, it is optimal to sell all items with a price $(A + 1)^{-\frac{1}{A}}$, where $A \equiv \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j$.*

Note that our main contribution in this setting is not only the discovery and proof of the optimal mechanism but also the development of a much simpler weak duality method for verifying optimality across a broad class of problems. The simpler dual helps us to derive the optimal mechanism in a short, elementary, and self-contained proof. We leverage the concept of weak duality by formulating a dual problem for our maximization problem. Since the dual objective provides an upper bound on the primal objective, showing that the same objective value can be achieved in both the primal and the dual establishes optimality. Here, AMD proves to be particularly useful. As we explain in Section 5, we can use AMD to obtain both a candidate solution to the primal and the corresponding solution to the dual, after which we need only compute the objective function’s value to complete the proof.

In our second result, we provide necessary and sufficient conditions for the optimality of grand bundling under the assumption that all bidders’ valuations are i.i.d. according to a uniform distribution on $[c, c+1]$. We identify a unique threshold c^* , which is determined by solving an n -dimensional equation that precisely indicates whether grand bundling is optimal.

Theorem 2. *Suppose the value of each item is uniformly distributed over $[c, c + 1]$ identically and independently. Then*

The optimal mechanism is grand bundling if and only if $c \in [0, c^]$*

where $c^ \in (0, n)$ is determined as follows: given an optimal price of grand bundle p (denote it as $p(c)$ since it depends on c), the solution of the equation $(n + 1)(c + 1 - p(c)) = c + 1$ on $c \in (0, n)$ is uniquely determined. That is c^* .*

This result was also conjectured by AMD, but our proof strategy leverages strong duality; rather than relying on weak duality, we use an approach proposed by Daskalakis et al. (2017) and apply it to the unit-demand case following Kash and Frongillo (2016). The key to the proof is the “pushed measure” we define in Section 4.

For sufficiency, we show that grand bundling is optimal if the pushed measure convexly dominates the original measure (in a specific sense). This measure-theoretic relation holds when the value of c is smaller than the threshold c^* .

For necessity, rather than constructing an alternative mechanism, we demonstrate that assuming $c > c^*$ leads to a contradiction in the optimality conditions. There are two key conditions for optimality, but these cannot simultaneously hold when $c > c^*$.

1.2 Related work

Our work belongs to a large body of literature on multi-item optimal auction design. There are very few results for the multiple-buyers case (Palfrey (1983), Yao (2017), Kolesnikov et al. (2022)), and the existing literature primarily focuses on the case of a single-buyer (Pavlov (2011); Daskalakis et al. (2017); Haghpanah and Hartline (2021)). The general optimal mechanism for the single buyer case is unknown, but some specific cases are solved. Manelli and Vincent (2007) established the condition under which the price schedule mechanism is optimal when the buyer has an additive preference and solved for two items case with some assumption on value distributions. Pavlov (2011) derived the optimal mechanism for two items when the buyer’s preference is either additive or unit-demand and the value of those uniformly distributed on $[c, c + 1]$ for any $c \geq 0$. Thirumulanathan et al. (2019) extended this result for two items, unit-demand buyer case, and established the optimal mechanism when the value of each item uniformly and independently distributed over $[c, c + d_1]$ and $[c, c + d_2]$ respectively. There are only a few results that proved to be optimal for n items (for any n); they are Giannakopoulos (2015), Daskalakis et al. (2017), Haghpanah and Hartline (2021) and Yang (2023) to best of our knowledge. Giannakopoulos (2015) and Daskalakis et al. (2017) consider the case in which the buyer’s valuation is additive, and they assume that the values of items are i.i.d. according to a specific value distribution. In particular, the former assumes the exponential distribution, where the density of value x is $f(x) = \lambda e^{-\lambda x}$, while the latter assumes the

uniform distribution over $[c, c + 1]$, where c depends on the number of items.² The optimal mechanism in both cases is to sell a bundle of all items. Haghpanah and Hartline (2021) provides a sufficient condition for selling all items at once to be optimal, but this condition is not easy to verify. Yang (2023) provided the sufficient condition for nested bundling to be optimal, but they focused on the case when the type space is one-dimensional.

We used a duality framework to prove the optimality. The duality approach has been taken by Giannakopoulos (2015), Giannakopoulos and Koutsoupias (2018), and Daskalakis et al. (2017). Giannakopoulos (2015), and Giannakopoulos and Koutsoupias (2018) derive weak duals, which identify the upper bounds of the achievable revenue levels. We extend the weak duality result by Giannakopoulos and Koutsoupias (2018) to the unit-demand case and establish the optimal mechanism when the cumulative distribution functions for the values of items $j = 1, \dots, n$ are given by $F_j(x_j) = x_j^{\alpha_j}$ ($\alpha_j > 0$) on the unit interval $[0, 1]$ independently. Although a weak dual provides upper bounds, the least upper bound in the dual problem may be strictly larger than the optimal revenue. In contrast, Daskalakis et al. (2017) provided a strong dual for a buyer with additive valuation, where the least upper bound found in the dual is guaranteed to be the optimal revenue. Kash and Frongillo (2016) extended the strong dual by Daskalakis et al. (2017) to the case of a unit-demand buyer. We leveraged this strong duality by Kash and Frongillo (2016) to establish the optimal mechanism when the value of each item is uniformly distributed over $[c, c + 1]$ identically and independently.

We used the Automated Mechanism Design (AMD) approach by neural network to guess the optimal auction mechanism. Dütting et al. (2023) developed a method for predicting optimal auction mechanisms using neural networks. Weiran et al. (2019) took a similar approach to ours, using neural networks to infer the optimal mechanism and then theoretically verifying whether the mechanism was indeed optimal. However, their analysis is limited to the case of two items.

2 Model

We consider a mechanism for one buyer and $n \geq 2$ items $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$. The buyer has a valuation function $x : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, where $x(S)$ denotes how much the buyer values the subset of items $S \subset N$. In particular, we consider the buyer to have a *unit-demand* valuation, where x satisfies $x(S) = \max_{j \in S} x(\{j\})$. Intuitively, the buyer cannot consume more than one item and chooses one that provides the largest utility from S . In this case, n numbers $x(\{1\}), \dots, x(\{n\})$ fully characterizes the valuation function x . Therefore, it suffices to consider the buyer to have n values $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$.

We consider x_j to be in interval $X_j = [L_j, H_j] \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. We denote the hyperrectangle of all possible buyer values by $X = \prod_{j=1}^n X_j$. The seller knows some probability distribution over X with an almost everywhere³ differentiable density function f .

The revelation principle (Mas-Colell et al. (1995)) shows that the optimal mechanism can be found in a class of mechanisms where the buyer reports her valuations and a truthful report is optimal. Hence, we denote our mechanism (a, p) as a pair of allocation rules $a : X \rightarrow \Delta(N \cup \{0\})$ and payment rules $p : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. We consider the probabilistic allocation over $n + 1$ candidates: allocating $\{1\}, \{2\}, \dots, \{n\}$, or allocating nothing. We do not consider allocating more than two items because the buyer consumes only one item. The buyer's utility when reporting $x' \equiv (x'_1, \dots, x'_n)$ under true valuation $x \equiv (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is

$$u(x'; x) = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j(x') x_j - p(x')$$

The seller's utility is captured by the revenue given by the mechanism $p(x')$.

It is standard in mechanism design to require mechanisms to satisfy the following properties:

Individual rationality (IR): $u(x; x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in X$

Incentive compatibility (IC): $u(x; x) \geq u(x'; x)$ for all $x, x' \in X$ We use the following characterization of incentive-compatible mechanisms by Rochet (1985).

²Although Giannakopoulos (2015) considers the exponential distribution for any $\lambda > 0$, it essentially covers a single distribution in the following sense. Consider the problem with any λ . If we change the unit of account so that the original λ is now called 1 in the new representation, the problem boils down to the one with $\lambda = 1$. Hence, all models can be expressed as the model under a single distribution with $\lambda = 1$. In contrast, the distributions we allow remain distinct even after the changes in the unit of account.

³with respect to Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^n

Lemma 1 (Rochet (1985)). A mechanism $M = (a, p)$ is truthful (IC) if and only if the utility functions $u(x) \equiv u(x|x)$ which the mechanism M induces have the following properties: (i) u is a convex function. (ii) u is almost everywhere (a.e.) differentiable with $\frac{\partial u(x)}{\partial x_j} = a_j(x)$ for all items $j = 1, \dots, n$ and a.e. $x \in X$.

We study the problem of maximizing the seller's expected revenue based on their prior knowledge of the joint distribution F under the IR and IC constraints. By lemma 1, it suffices to solve

$$\sup_u \int_X (\nabla u(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{x} - u(\mathbf{x})) f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \quad (1)$$

over the space of nonnegative convex functions u on X having the properties

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial u(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} \leq 1 \text{ and } \frac{\partial u(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} \geq 0 \text{ for a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in X, \text{ all } j \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

3 The results of $F_j(x) = x^{\alpha_j}$ cases

3.1 Dual Problem for Weak Duality

Motivated by traditional linear programming duality theory, we develop a duality theory framework that can be applied to the problem of designing mechanisms with optimal expected revenue. Giannakopoulos and Koutsoupias (2018) solved the problem of maximizing the seller's expected revenue using duality theory. However, the problem they established is for the case where the buyer has an additive utility function. This paper proves that the duality theory can also be used in the *unit-demand* case.

As in Giannakopoulos and Koutsoupias (2018), we ignore the convexity constraint in the primal problem. Let this primal problem be (1'). In Subsection 3.2, we will see that in a particular setting, the primal (1') achieves the same maximized value as (1).

Primal	Dual
$\sup_u \int_X (\nabla u(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{x} - u(\mathbf{x})) f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \quad (1')$	$\inf_{z, s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n} \int_X z(x) dx \quad (2)$
$\text{s.t. } \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial u(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} \leq 1,$	$\text{s.t. } \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial s_j(x)}{\partial x_j} \right) \leq (n+1)f(x) + x \cdot \nabla f(x),$
$\frac{\partial u(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} \geq 0,$	$z(L_j, x_{-j}) - s_j(L_j, x_{-j}) \leq L_j f(L_j, x_{-j}),$
$u(x) \geq 0.$	$z(H_j, x_{-j}) - s_j(H_j, x_{-j}) \geq H_j f(H_j, x_{-j}).$
$\text{for a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in X, \text{ all } j \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$	$z(x), s_1(x), \dots, s_n(x) \geq 0.$
	$\text{for a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in X.$

Lemma 2. The value of every feasible solution of the primal program (1') does not exceed the value of any feasible solution of the dual program (2).

Proof. The proof is in Appendix 7.1.1. □

3.2 Results by Weak Duality

We focus on the case where the valuations are independently drawn, and for each item j , there exists $\alpha_j > 0$ such that the cumulative distribution function is $F_j(x_j) = x_j^{\alpha_j}$ ($x_j \in [0, 1]$) and the density is $f_j(x_j) = \alpha_j x_j^{\alpha_j - 1}$. In other words, we consider n independent items distributed according to beta distributions with parameters α_j and 1. For example, when $\alpha_j = 1$, x_j follows a uniform distribution.

Theorem 1. *Suppose the cumulative distribution functions for the values of items $j = 1, \dots, n$ are given by $F_j(x_j) = x^{\alpha_j}$ ($\alpha_j > 0$) on the unit interval $[0, 1]$ independently. Then, it is optimal to sell all items with a price $(A + 1)^{-\frac{1}{A}}$, where $A \equiv \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j$.*

In other words, it is optimal to sell the right for the buyer to choose one item and buy it with a price $(A + 1)^{-\frac{1}{A}}$. Note that this provides revenue $A(A + 1)^{-\frac{A+1}{A}}$. If the distribution of each item's valuation is identical and uniform in $[0, 1]$, the value A corresponds to the number of items n , and the optimal price is $(n + 1)^{-\frac{1}{n}}$. Although it is natural to post the same price for all items under i.i.d. cases, it is strange that posting the same price remains the optimal mechanism even in non-identical cases.

Here, we would like to give some intuition about why posting the same price for all items is optimal even though each item follows a different distribution. The main reason comes from the nature of maximization problems and order statistics. Let us provide two settings. In the first setting, the seller has four items, and each valuation follows $U[0, 1]$ independently. In the second setting, the seller has four items with i.i.d. $U[0, 1]$ and must sell items 1, 2, and 3 together. The second setting has an additional constraint compared to the first setting. Then, the optimal revenue in the second setting must be weakly smaller than the one in the first setting. Suppose we already know that selling all items together is optimal in i.i.d. $U[0, 1]$ cases. Then, selling all items as a bundle is optimal in the first setting. Since this mechanism is also feasible in the second setting, it is proven that selling all items is optimal in the second setting as well.

By the nature of order statistics, the valuation of the bundle, consisting of items 1, 2, and 3, follows the distribution with a cumulative distribution function $F(x) = x^3$. Then, selling items 1, 2, and 3 together is equivalent to selling only one item, with its valuation being $F(x) = x^3$ in terms of revenue. Further, the second setting is equivalent to the case of selling two items with $\alpha_1 = 3$ and $\alpha_2 = 1$. Since selling all items at a certain price in the second setting is optimal, this mechanism is also optimal when selling two items with $\alpha_1 = 3$ and $\alpha_2 = 1$.

This is why posting the same price remains optimal under the case of $\alpha_1 = 3$ and $\alpha_2 = 1$. This argument also explains why the optimal price depends only on A , the sum of $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$. This argument applies only when $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are all integers. It is nontrivial whether this argument still holds when we expand the domain of α to $(0, \infty)$.

The straightforward way to prove Theorem 1 would be to find a pair of primal and dual solutions with the same objective function value. We have already had a candidate for a primal solution because Theorem 1 tells us that u is:

$$u(x) = u^*(x) \equiv \max\{\max(x) - p, 0\} \quad (2)$$

(we will denote above particular utility function as $u^*(x)$ hereafter) where $\max(x)$ denotes the maximal component of the vector x , i.e.,

$$\max(x) = \max\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}.$$

This function u^* corresponds to the utility function under truth-telling, as defined in Lemma 1. If grand bundling is implemented, the buyer's utility under truth-telling is given by the difference between their maximal component and the price p . If the maximal component does not exceed p , the buyer will not obtain any items and will not make any payment.

Our task is to prepare for the dual solution introduced in the Lemma 3 below. The dual problem in this case is:

$$\inf_{z, s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n} \int_{[0, 1]^n} z(x) dx$$

subject to

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial s_j(x)}{\partial x_j} \right) \leq (A + 1)f(x)$$

for all j , $\begin{cases} z(0, x_{-j}) - s_j(0, x_{-j}) \leq 0 \\ z(1, x_{-j}) - s_j(1, x_{-j}) \geq f(1, x_{-j}) \end{cases}$

$$z(x), s_1(x), s_2(x), \dots, s_n(x) \geq 0$$

for a.e. $x \in [0, 1]^n$.

Lemma 3. The following set of functions satisfies all constraints of the dual problem:

$$z(x) = \max\{0, g(\max(x))\} f(x)$$

$$s_j(x) = \begin{cases} z(x) \left(1 - \frac{x_j}{\max(x)}\right) & (x \neq 0) \\ 0 & (x = 0) \end{cases}$$

where

$$g(t) \equiv \begin{cases} \frac{(A+1)t - t^{1-A}}{A} & (t \neq 0) \\ 0 & (t = 0) \end{cases}$$

Moreover,

$$\int_{[0,1]^n} z(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = A(A+1)^{-\frac{A+1}{A}}.$$

If this lemma is true, weak duality implies that this set of functions is the solution to this dual problem, and further, Theorem 1 is true.

Proof. The proof is in Appendix 7.1.2. □

4 The results of $U[c, c+1]$ cases

4.1 Results by Strong Duality

In this section, we find the optimal mechanism for selling n items to a unit-demand buyer utility function for broader cases. We assume each valuation identically and independently follows the distribution $U[c, c+1](c \geq 0)$. Let G be a cumulative distribution function of $U[c, c+1]$ and p be a unique maximizer of expected revenue when we sell a grand bundle with price $q \in [c, c+1]$: $q(1 - G(q)^n)$.⁴

Theorem 2. *Suppose the value of each item is uniformly distributed over $[c, c+1]$ identically and independently. Then*

$$\text{The optimal mechanism is grand bundling if and only if } c \in [0, c^*]$$

where $c^* \in (0, n)$ is determined as follows: given an optimal price of grand bundle p (denote it as $p(c)$ since it depends on c), the solution of the equation $(n+1)(c+1 - p(c)) = c+1$ on $c \in (0, n)$ is uniquely determined. That is c^* .

We show the above theorem in Section 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, and Appendix.

4.2 Analysis of c^*

In this subsection, we will see some qualitative properties of c^* . Since the value of c^* depends on n , we will denote it as c_n^* in this section. First of all, c_n^* is well-defined and uniquely determined. For example, $c_2^* = 1$, $c_3^* = \frac{11-\sqrt{33}}{4} \simeq 1.31$, and $c_4^* \simeq 1.57$.

Proposition 1. *n -dimensional equation $(n+1)^n - (n-c)^n - n^2(c+1)(n-c)^{n-1} = 0$ has a unique solution on $c \in (0, n)$. That is c_n^* .*

Proof. The proof is in Appendix 7.2. □

By Proposition 1 and its proof, the following corollary can be derived.

Corollary 1. *Suppose the value of each item is uniformly distributed over $[c, c+1]$ identically and independently. The optimal mechanism is grand bundling if and only if*

$$c \in [0, n] \text{ and } (n+1)^n - (n-c)^n - n^2(c+1)(n-c)^{n-1} \leq 0$$

⁴ $q(1 - G(q)^n)$ has a unique maximizer on $(c, c+1)$. To see this, let $h(q) = (q(1 - G(q)^n))'$. We can prove the existence of the unique maximizer on $(c, c+1)$ by getting $h(c) = 1 > 0$, $h(c+1) = -n(c+1) < 0$ and $h'(q) < 0$ for all $q \in (c, c+1)$.

Thus, given number of items $n \geq 2$ and the value $c \geq 0$, we can easily verify whether the grand bundling is optimal by above condition.

In particular, this threshold is strictly increasing with respect to n , meaning that grand bundling becomes more likely to be optimal as the number of items increases. Moreover, as the number of items approaches infinity, grand bundling becomes optimal for any $c \geq 0$, since the threshold diverges to infinity as n goes to infinity. We will formally state these results as follows:

Proposition 2. c_n^* is strictly increasing in $n \geq 2$.

Proof. The proof is in Appendix 7.2. □

Proposition 3. $c_n^* \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, we have $c_n^* > \frac{\ln n}{3}$ for all $n \geq 2$.

Proof. The proof is in Appendix 7.2. □

The interpretation of the above two results is as follows: Fixing any $c \geq 0$, consider the case when the monopolist guesses that the buyer's value is distributed according to $U[c, c + 1]$ independently. When there are not enough goods, the optimal mechanism may not be grand bundling. But if we increase the number of items, the probability that the highest value among the goods is close to $c + 1$ increases; more formally, the expected value of the highest order statistic gets close to $c + 1$. Therefore, rather than presenting a mechanism with unnecessarily additional menus, offering a mechanism with only the grand bundle allows for greater surplus extraction (recall that we only need to consider mechanisms that allocate at most one good to the buyer since the buyer has a unit-demand preference.)

4.3 Dual Problem for Strong Duality

Below, we sketch the main ideas of the proof of Theorem 2. Instead of using the weak duality discussed throughout this paper, we switch to strong duality in this section. Daskalakis et al. (2017) introduced the strong duality in the additive case, and Kash and Frongillo (2016) extended it to a unit-demand case.

After defining some components, we state the strong duality. We introduce some useful notations in the same way as in Daskalakis et al. (2017):

- Denote $\mathcal{U}(X)$ as the set of all continuous, non-decreasing, and convex functions $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$
- $\Gamma(X)$ and $\Gamma_+(X)$ denote the sets of signed and unsigned measures on X respectively.
- Given an unsigned measure $\gamma \in \Gamma_+(X \times X)$, γ_1 and γ_2 denote the two marginals of γ , i.e. $\gamma_1(E) = \gamma(E \times X)$ and $\gamma_2(E) = \gamma(X \times E)$ for all measurable sets $E \subset X$.
- For a (signed) measure μ and a measurable $E \subset X$, we define the restriction of μ to E , denoted $\mu|_E$, by the property $\mu|_E(S) = \mu(E \cap S)$ for all measurable S .
- For a signed measure μ , we will denote by μ_+, μ_- the positive and negative parts of μ , respectively. That is, $\mu = \mu_+ - \mu_-$, where μ_+ and μ_- provide mass to disjoint subsets of X .

Definition 1 (Daskalakis et al. (2017), Definition 3). *The transformed measure μ of f is the signed measure supported within X defined as*

$$\mu(E) \equiv \int_{\partial X} \mathbb{I}_E(x) f(x) (x \cdot \hat{n}) dx - \int_X \mathbb{I}_E(x) (\nabla f(x) \cdot x + (n+1)f(x)) dx + \mathbb{I}_E((L_1, \dots, L_n))$$

for all measurable sets E , where $\mathbb{I}_E(\cdot)$ denotes the indicator function on E and \hat{n} denotes the outer unit normal field to the boundary ∂X .

We will calculate transformed measure of our setting: n items uniformly and independently distributed over $[c, c + 1]$ as in Daskalakis et al. (2017), Subsection 2.2:

Suppose each value of n items uniformly and independently distributed over $[c, c + 1]$ with $c \geq 0$. So that $X = [c, c + 1]^n$.

The joint distribution of the items is given by the constant density function $f = 1$ throughout X . The transformed measure μ of f is given by the relation

$$\mu(E) \equiv \mathbb{I}_E(c, \dots, c) + \int_{\partial X} \mathbb{I}_E(x) (x \cdot \hat{n}) dx - (n+1) \int_X \mathbb{I}_E(x) dx$$

for all measurable set $E \subset X$. Therefore, μ is the sum of:

- A point mass of +1 at the point (c, \dots, c) .
- A mass of $-(n+1)$ distributed uniformly throughout the region X .
- For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, a mass of $+(c+1)$ distributed uniformly on each surface $\{x \in \partial X : x_i = c+1\}$.
- For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, a mass of $-c$ distributed uniformly on each surface $\{x \in \partial X : x_i = c\}$.

Then, as in Kash and Frongillo (2016), we can rewrite the above optimization problem as

$$\sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}(X)} \int_X u d\mu \tag{3}$$

$$\text{s.t. } u(x) - u(x') \leq \|x - x'\|_\infty, \text{ for all } x, x' \in X. \tag{4}$$

Definition 2 (Daskalakis et al. (2017), Definition 5). *Let α and β be a signed Radon measure on X . α convexly dominates β , denoted $\alpha \succeq_{\text{cvx}} \beta$, if for all $u \in \mathcal{U}(X)$,*

$$\int_X u d\alpha \geq \int_X u d\beta$$

Moreover, given a measurable set $E \subset X$, we denote $\alpha|_E \succeq_{\text{cvx}} \beta|_E$, if for all $u \in \mathcal{U}(X)$,

$$\int_E u d\alpha \geq \int_E u d\beta$$

The following lemma corresponds to the strong duality framework first proposed by Daskalakis et al. (2017). The following is its unit-demand version, as introduced in Kash and Frongillo (2016). While this is not technically strong duality in its original form, it serves as a helpful variant by focusing on complete slackness and directly formulating the optimality conditions.

Lemma 4. (Kash and Frongillo (2016), Corollary 4.1.) *u is optimal in (3) if and only if there exists a positive Radon measures supported within $X \times X$, γ , such that*

$$\gamma_1 - \gamma_2 \succeq_{\text{cvx}} \mu \tag{5}$$

$$\int_{[c, c+1]^n} u d(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2) = \int_{[c, c+1]^n} u d\mu \tag{6}$$

$$u(x) - u(y) = \|x - y\|_\infty \gamma(x, y)\text{-almost surely} \tag{7}$$

where γ_1 and γ_2 are Radon measure on X defined as $\gamma_1(E) = \gamma(E \times X)$ and $\gamma_2(E) = \gamma(X \times E)$.

Since we conjecture that grand bundling is optimal, the function $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ introduced above is the same as (2), that is:

$$u(x) = u^*(x) \equiv \max\{\max(x) - p, 0\},$$

In the following subsection, we will identify a positive Radon measure γ on $X \times X$ that satisfies the optimality condition in the sufficiency proof. For the necessity proof, we will show that no such measure γ can exist if u is defined as above. This establishes a clear distinction between the cases where grand bundling is optimal and where it is not.

4.4 Pushed measure

The following subsection identifies a measure γ that ensures u , associated with grand bundling, remains optimal. Here, the concept of the ‘‘pushed measure’’ plays a crucial role in the proof. As a preparatory step, we first define the upper set and introduce the terminology for each region in X that we divide.

Definition 3. *Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $E \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, we call $U \subset E$ is a upper set with respect to E if*

$$\text{For all } x \in U \text{ and } x' \in E, x \leq x' \text{ implies that } x' \in U$$

When $U \subset E$ is an upper set with respect to E , we would just say $U \subset E$ is an upper set with abuse of terminology.

Denote each region of X as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} W &\equiv \{x \in X : \max(x) \in (p, c + 1]\} \\ Z &\equiv \{x \in X : \max(x) \in [c, p]\} \\ B &\equiv \{x \in X : \max(x) = c + 1\} \\ B_Z &\equiv \{x \in X : \max(x) = p\} \end{aligned}$$

Now, we are ready to introduce the pushed set and the pushed measure.

Definition 4. For upper set $U \subset B$, the pushed set $push(U)$ is defined on $W \cup B_Z$ as follows:

$$push(U) \equiv \{y \in W \cup B_Z \mid \text{there exists } x \in U \cap B \text{ such that } u^*(x) - u^*(y) = \|x - y\|_\infty\}$$

Definition 5. γ_1 is a measure on B defined as

$$\gamma_1(U) \equiv \mu_-(push(U))$$

for all measurable upper set $U \subset B$.⁵

In fact, the pushed measure plays a crucial role in establishing grand bundling's optimality. This measure is particularly significant in understanding why grand bundling remains the best mechanism under certain conditions. However, since its relevance is more directly tied to the necessity argument, we will postpone a detailed explanation until the necessity section, where we will provide a thorough discussion on why this pushed measure is essential for proving optimality.

Here, instead of explaining more about the pushed measure, we will introduce an equivalent characterization of the pushed set defined in Definition 4 as follows:

Lemma 5. For all upper set $U \subset B$ with respect to B and all $y \in W \cup B_Z$, the following holds⁶

$$y + t\mathbf{1} \in U \cap B \text{ for some } t \in \mathbb{R} \iff y \in push(U)$$

Proof. The proof is in Appendix 7.3. □




Figure 1: Shape of $push(U)$ when $n = 2$.

The above lemma implies that $push(U)$ is illustrated in Figure 1, and

$$\gamma_1(U) = \mu_-\left(\left\{y \in W \cup B_Z \mid \text{there exists } t \in \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } x + t\mathbf{1} \in U\right\}\right)$$

for any measurable upper set $U \subseteq B$. We will fully leverage this equivalent characterization of γ_1 to prove sufficiency of the following Theorem 3 in Appendix 7.4.

⁵Notice that γ_1 is well-defined as a measure on B by above since Borel σ -algebra on B is generated by the set of all measurable upper sets on B .

⁶we will denote $\mathbf{1}$ as the n -dimensional vector in \mathbb{R}^n whose components are all 1, i.e. $\mathbf{1} \equiv (1, \dots, 1)$.

Theorem 3. *Suppose that the value of each item is uniformly distributed over $[c, c + 1]$ identically and independently. Then*

$$\text{The optimal mechanism is grand bundling} \iff \gamma_1 \succeq_{cvx} \mu_+.$$

Indeed, the threshold c^* corresponds directly to the condition stated above, which asserts that the pushed measure convexly dominates the original measure, μ_+ .

Proposition 4. *If the value of each item is uniformly distributed over $[c, c + 1]$ identically and independently,*

$$\gamma_1 \succeq_{cvx} \mu_+ \iff c \in [0, c^*].$$

Proof Sketch. The main reason for this relationship stems from the density functions of the respective measures. In Lemma 11 in the Appendix 7.4, we prove that

$$f^{\gamma_1}(x) \equiv \begin{cases} (n+1)(\min(x) - c) + c & \text{if } 2c + 1 - p > \max(x), \\ (n+1)(c + 1 - p) & \text{if } \max(x) \geq 2c + 1 - p \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

can be interpreted as the density function of γ_1 in a certain sense. The density of μ_+ is calculated as $c + 1$, and the condition $(n+1)(c + 1 - p) \geq c + 1$ plays a crucial role in determining whether γ_1 convexly dominates μ_+ . This condition is equivalent to $c \leq c^*$, establishing the threshold for grand bundling's optimality.

It is straightforward to see that if $(n+1)(c + 1 - p) < c + 1$, then γ_1 does not convexly dominate μ_+ . This follows from constructing a function that is positive only in the region where $\max(x) \geq 2c + 1 - p$. The sufficiency argument is more intricate and will be established via induction on n in Appendix 7.3 and 7.4. \square

4.5 Proof Sketch of Theorem 3

This subsection explains the proof sketch of Theorem 3. First, we will consider sufficiency of Theorem 3 by the following proposition:

Proposition 5. *Grand bundling is optimal if*

$$\gamma_1 \succeq_{cvx} \mu_+.$$

Proof Sketch. Since γ_1 convexly dominates μ_+ , the optimality condition is easily satisfied by choosing a measure γ^* such that $\gamma_1^* = \gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2^* = \mu_+$. Then, the third condition follows immediately as

$$\gamma_1^* - \gamma_2^* \succeq_{cvx} \mu = \mu_+ - \mu_-.$$

The remaining conditions are also verified using the properties of the pushed measure. For instance, the pushed measure ensures the almost sure (a.s.) condition by definition. Furthermore, the integral condition for u is also satisfied because μ_- remains unchanged. Therefore, for the function U , any modifications occur on a set of measure zero, which does not affect the integral. \square

Next, we will explain the necessity part in Theorem 3. As in Theorem 2 in Daskalakis et al. (2017), when considering feasible dual variable $\delta \in \Gamma_+(X \times X)$, note that we can assume $\delta_1(X) = \delta_2(X) = \mu_+(X)$, $\delta_1 \succeq_{cvx} \mu_+$ and $\mu_- \succeq_{cvx} \delta_2$ hold.

Theorem 4. *If $\gamma_1 \succeq_{cvx} \mu_+$ does not hold, there does not exist $\delta \in \Gamma_+(X \times X)$ such that*

$$\mu_+(X) = \delta_1(X) = \delta_2(X), \quad (9)$$

$$\delta_1 \succeq_{cvx} \mu_+, \quad (10)$$

$$\mu_- \succeq_{cvx} \delta_2, \quad (11)$$

$$u^*(x) - u^*(y) = \|x - y\|_\infty \delta(x, y)\text{-almost surely}, \quad (12)$$

$$\int_X u^* d(\delta_1 - \delta_2) = \int_X u^* d\mu. \quad (13)$$

Here, we provide the roadmap of the proof. We derive a contradiction by assuming that $\gamma_1 \succ_{cvx} \mu_+$ does not hold and that $\delta \in \Gamma_+(X \times X)$ satisfies all conditions (9), (10), (11), (12), and (13). In particular, we aim to show that (10) fails under these assumptions. To achieve this, we establish the existence of a function $u \in \mathcal{U}(X)$ such that $\int_X u d\delta_1 < \int_X u d\mu_+$.

A natural candidate for $u \in \mathcal{U}(X)$ arises from the fact that $\gamma_1 \succeq_{cvx} \mu_+$ does not hold. This implies the existence of some function $u \in \mathcal{U}(X)$ satisfying $\int_X u d\gamma_1 < \int_X u d\mu_+$. By Proposition 4, we know that $c < c^*$, and the density function in equation (8) indicates that any function that is positive only in the region where $\max(x) \geq 2x + 1 - p$ satisfies this inequality.

To be concrete, consider the function

$$v(x) \equiv \max\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i - (nc + n + c - p), 0\right).$$

Since

$$v(c + 1, \dots, c + 1, 2c + 1 - p) = 0,$$

it follows that $v(x) < 0$ whenever $\max(x) < 2c + 1 - p$, leading to

$$\int_X v d\gamma_1 < \int_X v d\mu_+ \tag{14}$$

Our goal is now to show that the same inequality holds for any δ satisfying all conditions. To proceed, we rely on three key assumptions: convex order (10), (11), the almost sure condition (12), and the integral equality condition (13).

The main challenge is effectively using the almost sure condition and the integral equality condition. First, the convex order conditions (10) and (11) allow us to rewrite the integral equality condition (13) in a more useful form, which we will utilize in the following steps.

Lemma 6. Suppose that there exists $\delta \in \Gamma_+(X \times X)$ that satisfies (10), (11) and (13). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X u^* d\delta_1 &= \int_X u^* d\mu_+, \\ \int_X u^* d\delta_2 &= \int_X u^* d\mu_-. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since u^* is continuous, non-decreasing, and convex, (10) and (11) mean

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X u^* d\delta_1 &\geq \int_X u^* d\mu_+, \\ \int_X u^* d\delta_2 &\leq \int_X u^* d\mu_-. \end{aligned}$$

Here, (13) implies that both inequalities hold with equality. □

Additionally, (10) and (11) also allow us to derive a fundamental property about δ , which will serve as the foundation for the subsequent discussion.

Lemma 7. Suppose that there exists $\delta \in \Gamma_+(X \times X)$ that satisfies (9), (10), (11) and, (13).

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_1(Z) &= \mu_+(Z) \\ \delta_1(B) &= \mu_+(B) \end{aligned}$$

In particular, the second equation and (9) implies that δ_1 that satisfies (9), (10), (11) and, (13) has measure only on $Z \cup B$.

Proof. The proof is in Appendix 7.5. □

Next, the following lemma provides an effective way to utilize the almost-sure condition. This lemma illustrates how the almost-sure condition constrains the measure. For example, suppose that $\delta_2 = \mu_-$. Then, this implies that δ_1 is always weakly smaller than the pushed measure γ . Overall, this lemma helps establish an upper bound for δ_1 , which is key to demonstrating why the inequality holds for any δ .

Lemma 8. Suppose that there exists $\delta \in \Gamma_+(X \times X)$ that satisfies (12). Then the following two equations hold:

$$\delta_1(Z \setminus B_Z) = \delta_2(Z \setminus B_Z)$$

$$\delta_1(U \cap W) \leq \delta_2(\text{push}(U) \cap W) + (\delta_2 - \delta_1)(\text{push}(U) \cap B_Z) \text{ for all upper set } U \subset B \text{ with respect to } B.$$

Proof. The proof is in Appendix 7.5. \square

Moreover, the Lemma 8 implies the following lemma. First, we will define the pushed function.

Definition 6. For a bounded function $b : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $b_{\text{push}} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$b_{\text{push}}(x) = b(x + t\mathbf{1}), \text{ where } t = c + 1 - \max(x).$$

Lemma 9. Suppose that $c > c^*$ and there exists $\delta \in \Gamma_+(X \times X)$ that satisfies (9), (10), (11), (12) and (13). Then, for all nonnegative, bounded and nondecreasing functions $b : B \rightarrow [0, \infty)$,

$$\int_W b(x) d\gamma_1 = \int_W b_{\text{push}}(x) d\mu_-, \quad (15)$$

$$\int_W b(x) d\delta_1 \leq \int_W b_{\text{push}}(x) d\delta_2 + \int_{B_Z} b_{\text{push}}(x) d(\delta_2 - \delta_1), \quad (16)$$

Proof. The proof is in Appendix 7.5. \square

The following lemma completes the proof of Theorem 4 by utilizing the integral equality condition. By using the integral equality condition, we can freely add the u^* to the original function, making it convex.

Lemma 10. Suppose that $c > c^*$ and there exists $\delta \in \Gamma_+(X \times X)$ that satisfies (9), (10), (11), (12) and (13). Then $\delta_1 \succeq_{cvx} \mu_+$ does not hold.

Proof Sketch. Let $\tilde{v} : B \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be the restriction of v to B , i.e. $\tilde{v} \equiv v|_B$. Define $v_t : X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ as

$$v_t(x) \equiv \max(\tilde{v}_{\text{push}}(x) + (n+t)(\max(x) - p), 0)$$

for $t > 0$. We can prove that

$$\tilde{v}_{\text{push}}(x) + (n+t)(\max(x) - p) = \max\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i - c - (n-1)p, n(\max(x) - p)\right) + t(\max(x) - p).$$

Since the pointwise maximum of affine functions is convex and all affine terms are non-decreasing, their sum remains convex. Thus, v_t is in $\mathcal{U}(X)$ and by (11),

$$\int_X v_t d(\mu_- - \delta_2) \geq 0 \text{ for all } t > 0.$$

By $v_t(x) = \tilde{v}_{\text{push}}(x) + (n+t)u^*(x)$ for $x \in W \cup B_Z$ and Lemma 6,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \int_X v_t d(\mu_- - \delta_2) &= \int_{W \cup B_Z} v_t d(\mu_- - \delta_2) + \int_{Z \setminus B_Z} v_t d(\mu_- - \delta_2) \\ &= \int_{W \cup B_Z} \tilde{v}_{\text{push}} d(\mu_- - \delta_2) + \int_{Z \setminus B_Z} v_t d(\mu_- - \delta_2) \quad (\because \text{Lemma 6}) \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $v_t(x)$, notice that for all $x \in Z \setminus B_Z$, $v_t(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, by the bounded convergence theorem,

$$0 \leq \int_{W \cup B_Z} \tilde{v}_{\text{push}} d(\mu_- - \delta_2) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_{Z \setminus B_Z} v_t d(\mu_- - \delta_2) = \int_{W \cup B_Z} \tilde{v}_{\text{push}} d(\mu_- - \delta_2).$$

Moreover, by (15) and (16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_{W \cup B_Z} \tilde{v}_{\text{push}} d(\mu_- - \delta_2) \\ &\leq \int_W \tilde{v}_{\text{push}} d(\mu_- - \delta_2) + \int_{B_Z} \tilde{v}_{\text{push}} d(\delta_1 - \delta_2) \quad (\because \text{By calculation}) \\ &= \int_W \tilde{v} d(\gamma_1 - \delta_1) \quad (\because (15)(16)) \\ &= \int_X v d(\gamma_1 - \delta_1) \quad (\because \text{By nature of } \gamma, \delta, \text{ and } v) \end{aligned}$$

This and (14) completes the proof. \square

5 The Automated Mechanism Design Approach

Our result was conjectured by the Automated Mechanism Design approach, which leverages computer algorithms to identify optimal mechanisms. We first numerically derive a candidate for the optimal mechanism in small-scale problems with specific distributions using the deep-learning-based algorithm developed by Dütting et al. (2023). We then generalize this mechanism to n -item setting with a broader class of distributions and employ the duality approach to establish its optimality formally. In addition to identifying the optimal mechanism, we use computational methods to approximate the optimal dual variables. In hindsight, our simple optimal mechanism might have been discovered without computational assistance; however, deriving it from first principles alone would have been nearly infeasible. The Automated Mechanism Design approach thus highlights a promising role for AI in theoretical economic research—namely, automating part of the research process by using computer algorithms to infer optimal mechanisms.

5.1 The primal problem (1)

For the primal problem (1), Dütting et al. (2023) provides useful methods when the number of items is small. We utilize the *RochetNet* architecture introduced in their paper. For our analysis, we consider the following three cases:

1. In the first case, we assume that the number of items is $n = 2$, and the valuations of item 1 (x_1) and item 2 (x_2) are independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.) according to the uniform distribution $U[0, 1]$ (Figure 2).
2. In the second case, we again consider $n = 2$, where x_1 follows the cumulative distribution function (CDF) $F_1(x_1) = x_1^{1/2}$, and x_2 follows the CDF $F_2(x_2) = x_2^2$, independently of x_1 (Figure 3).
3. In the third case, we extend the analysis to $n = 3$, assuming that x_1, x_2 , and x_3 are i.i.d. according to the uniform distribution $U[1, 2]$ (Figure 4).

The three figures made by the RochetNet architecture illustrate the allocation probability of each item. Dark red represents a probability of 1, while yellow represents a probability of 0. The transition from dark red to yellow occurs when the maximum valuation of the items exceeds a certain price threshold. Based on the figures, grand bundling appears to be optimal for all cases.




Figure 2: The optimal allocation function in the case where the valuations of two items are independently drawn from $U[0, 1]$.

5.2 The dual problem(2) in Section3

We also took the AMD approach to find the dual variable of the dual problem(2) in Section3. We employed two different methods to obtain candidate solutions for the dual problem(2).

First, we discretized the dual problem, transforming the original problem into a finite-dimensional linear programming problem. By solving this linear programming problem, we obtain an approximate solution to the dual problem for $n = 2$. Figure 5 presents the results of the linear programming approach applied to the dual problem corresponding to the primal problem where $x_1, x_2 \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} U[0, 1]$.




Figure 3: The optimal allocation function in the case where the valuations of two items are independently drawn from $x_1 \sim F_1$ and $x_2 \sim F_2$.




Figure 4: The optimal allocation function in the case where the valuations of three items are independently drawn from $U[1,2]$. The results are plotted by fixing x_3 at 1.2, 1.5, and 1.8 while varying x_1 and x_2 .




Figure 5: The approximated solutions z , s_1 , and s_2 obtained from the discretized dual problem. Each graph illustrates the values of z , s_1 , and s_2 for different input values $(x_1, x_2) \in [0, 1]^2$.

Second, we employed neural networks to solve the dual problem corresponding to the primal problem where $x_1, x_2 \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U[0, 1]$. To obtain an approximate solution, we constructed neural networks representing the functions z , s_1 , and s_2 of the dual problem, respectively, and trained them to minimize the objective function while satisfying the constraints of the dual problem. The augmented Lagrangian method was used to solve the constrained training problem. Figure 6 presents the results of solving the dual problem.




Figure 6: The approximated solutions z , s_1 , and s_2 obtained using neural networks. Each graph illustrates the values of z , s_1 , and s_2 for different input values $(x_1, x_2) \in [0, 1]^2$.

We observed that the simple geometric structures in Figures 5 and 6 correspond to specific functional forms. Through analytical verification, we confirmed that these functional forms can yield the revenue of the candidate mechanism for n items under a uniform distribution. Consequently, we derived the optimal mechanism for this case and further generalized it to the broader class of distributions under consideration.

6 Conclusion

For over 40 years, the optimal mechanism for multiple items has been an unsolved problem mainly due to its difficulty in proving the optimality. Here, we provide broadly applicable and easy-to-interpret results, focusing on a single buyer who can consume one item.

First, we show that selling each item at an identical price is optimal for any number of items when the value distributions fall within a class that includes the uniform distribution as a special case. The demonstration of this optimality admits an elementary and self-contained proof through a weak dual we constructed, which is much simpler than the measure-theoretic strong dual by Daskalakis et al. (2017).

Similarly, we demonstrate that bundling all items together is also optimal when and only when the values of multiple goods are independently drawn from $U[c, c+1]$, subject to specific conditions on c that determine the feasibility of bundling. To verify the sufficiency and necessity, we defined a new notion of pushed set and pushed measure and applied them to the strong duality by Daskalakis et al. (2017).

To identify the optimal mechanism, we employed the Automated Mechanism Design (AMD) approach, using the deep learning algorithm by Dütting et al. (2023) to numerically solve small-sized problems for specific distributions. These numerical insights were then generalized through an educated conjecture and rigorously verified via duality theory. This combination of AMD and duality provides a practical and efficient framework for verifying optimal solutions, making mechanism design more accessible for real-world applications in policy and resource allocation.

7 Appendix

7.1 Omitted proof in Section 3

7.1.1 Proof of Lemma 2

Proof of Lemma 2. Take any u , which is a feasible solution of the primal program (1'), and any z, s_1, \dots, s_n , which is a feasible solution of the dual program (2). we will prove that

$$\int_X z(x) dx \geq \int_X (\nabla u(x) \cdot x - u(x)) f(x) dx$$

for such u and z, s_1, \dots, s_n . First, since $\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial u(x)}{\partial x_j} \leq 1$ and $\frac{\partial u(x)}{\partial x_j} \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X z(x) dx &= \int_X \left\{ z(x) \cdot 1 - \sum_{j=1}^n 0 \cdot s_j(x) \right\} dx \geq \int_X \left\{ z(x) \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial u(x)}{\partial x_j} - \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial u(x)}{\partial x_j} s_j(x) \right\} dx \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \int_X (z(x) - s_j(x)) \frac{\partial u(x)}{\partial x_j} dx \end{aligned}$$

By integral by parts,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^n \int_X (z(x) - s_j(x)) \frac{\partial u(x)}{\partial x_j} dx \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left\{ \int_{X_{-j}} [(z(x) - s_j(x)) u(x)]_{x_j=L_j}^{x_j=H_j} dx_{-j} - \int_X \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial s_j(x)}{\partial x_j} \right) u(x) dx \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Then, since z, s_1, \dots, s_n satisfies

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial s_j(x)}{\partial x_j} \right) \leq (n+1)f(x) + x \cdot \nabla f(x),$$

$$\text{for all } j \begin{cases} z(L_j, x_{-j}) - s_j(L_j, x_{-j}) \leq L_j f(L_j, x_{-j}) \\ z(H_j, x_{-j}) - s_j(H_j, x_{-j}) \geq H_j f(H_j, x_{-j}) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^n \left\{ \int_{X_{-j}} [(z(x) - s_j(x)) u(x)]_{x_j=L_j}^{x_j=H_j} dx_{-j} - \int_X \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial s_j(x)}{\partial x_j} \right) u(x) dx \right\} \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^n \left\{ \int_{X_{-j}} [x_j u(x) f(x)]_{x_j=L_j}^{x_j=H_j} dx_{-j} \right\} - \int_X u(x) \{ (n+1)f(x) + x \cdot \nabla f(x) \} dx \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left\{ \int_{X_{-j}} [x_j u(x) f(x)]_{x_j=L_j}^{x_j=H_j} dx_{-j} - \int_X u(x) f(x) dx - \int_X u(x) x_j \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_j} dx \right\} - \int_X u(x) f(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

Using integral by parts,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^n \left\{ \int_{X_{-j}} [x_j u(x) f(x)]_{x_j=L_j}^{x_j=H_j} dx_{-j} - \int_X u(x) f(x) dx - \int_X u(x) x_j \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_j} dx \right\} - \int_X u(x) f(x) dx \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left\{ \int_X x_j \frac{\partial u(x)}{\partial x_j} f(x) dx \right\} - \int_X u(x) f(x) dx \\ &= \int_X (\nabla u(x) \cdot x - u(x)) f(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\int_X z(x) dx \geq \int_X (\nabla u(x) \cdot x - u(x)) f(x) dx$$

for such u and z, s_1, \dots, s_n . □

7.1.2 Proof of Lemma 3

Proof of Lemma 3. 1. Regarding the first constraint, let

$$\begin{aligned} p &\equiv (A+1)^{-\frac{1}{A}} \\ R_0 &\equiv (0, p)^n \\ R_j &\equiv \{x \in (0, 1)^n \mid x_j > x_i, \text{ for all } i \neq j, \text{ and } p < x_j\}, j = 1, \dots, n \\ R &\equiv \bigcup_{j=0}^n R_j \end{aligned}$$

We will prove that for all $x \in R$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial s_j(x)}{\partial x_j} \right) \leq (A+1)f(x).$$

This implies that the first constraint is satisfied almost everywhere on $[0, 1]^n$. Actually, if $x \notin R$, there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $x_j \in \{0, p, 1\}$ or there exists $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ with $i \neq j$ such that $x_i = x_j$. This implies $[0, 1]^n \setminus R$ is a subset of a finite union of hyperplanes on \mathbb{R}^n . Since any hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^n does not have a positive Lebesgue measure, the Lebesgue measure of $[0, 1]^n \setminus R$ is also zero. Note that

$$p < \max(\mathbf{x}) \Leftrightarrow 0 < g(\max(\mathbf{x}))$$

because $(A+1)t - t^{1-A} > 0 \Leftrightarrow t > p$.

(a) For all $x \in R_0$, $z(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ and $s_j(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, n$. Then for all $x \in R_0$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial s_j(x)}{\partial x_j} \right) = 0 \leq (A+1)f(x)$$

(b) Take any $j^* \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. For all $x \in R_{j^*}$, z and s_j are simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} z(\mathbf{x}) &= g(x_{j^*})f(x) \\ s_j(x) &= z(x) \left(1 - \frac{x_j}{x_{j^*}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial z(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} &= \begin{cases} g'(x_{j^*})f(x) + g(x_{j^*})f(x) \cdot \frac{\alpha_{j^*} - 1}{x_{j^*}} & (j = j^*) \\ g(x_{j^*})f(x) \cdot \frac{\alpha_j - 1}{x_j} & (j \neq j^*) \end{cases} \\ \frac{\partial s_j(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} &= \begin{cases} 0 & (j = j^*) \\ g(x_{j^*})f(x) \left(\frac{\alpha_j - 1}{x_j} - \frac{\alpha_j}{x_{j^*}} \right) & (j \neq j^*) \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial s_j(x)}{\partial x_j} \right) &= \frac{\partial z(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_{j^*}} + \sum_{j \neq j^*} \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial s_j(x)}{\partial x_j} \right) \\ &= g'(x_{j^*})f(x) + g(x_{j^*})f(x) \cdot \frac{\alpha_{j^*} - 1}{x_{j^*}} + \sum_{j \neq j^*}^n g(x_{j^*})f(x) \cdot \frac{\alpha_j}{x_{j^*}} \\ &= \left\{ g'(x_{j^*}) + (A-1) \frac{g(x_{j^*})}{x_{j^*}} \right\} f(x) \\ &= (A+1)f(x) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial z(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial s_j(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} \right) = (A+1)f(x)$$

By (a) and (b),

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial z(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial s_j(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} \right) \leq (A+1)f(x), \text{ for all } x \in R$$

2. Regarding the second and third constraints, note that

$$\begin{aligned} z(1, \mathbf{x}_{-j}) &= f(1, \mathbf{x}_{-j}) \\ s_j(1, \mathbf{x}_{-j}) &= 0 \\ s_j(0, \mathbf{x}_{-j}) &= z(0, \mathbf{x}_{-j}) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for all j and for all $x_{-j} \in [0, 1]^{n-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} z(1, \mathbf{x}_{-j}) - s_j(1, \mathbf{x}_{-j}) &\geq f(1, \mathbf{x}_{-j}) \\ z(0, \mathbf{x}_{-j}) - s_j(0, \mathbf{x}_{-j}) &\leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

3. The fourth constraint is easily confirmed because $\max\{0, g(\max(x))\}$, $f(x)$, and $\left(1 - \frac{x_j}{\max(x)}\right)$ are nonnegative.

4. Finally, we will prove that $\int_{[0,1]^n} z(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} = A(A+1)^{-\frac{A+1}{A}}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[0,1]^n} z(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} &= \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{p \leq \max(\mathbf{x})=x_j} g(x_j)f(x)d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \int_p^1 \int_0^{x_j} \cdots \int_0^{x_j} g(x_j)f_j(x_j) \prod_{i \neq j} f_i(x_i) dx_n dx_{n-1} \cdots dx_1 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \int_p^1 g(x_j)f_j(x_j) \prod_{i \neq j} F_i(x_j) dx_j \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \int_p^1 \frac{(A+1)t^A - 1}{A} dt \\ &= A \left[\frac{1}{A} t^{A+1} - \frac{t}{A} \right]_p^1 \\ &= A(A+1)^{-\frac{A+1}{A}} \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

7.2 Omitted proof in Subsection 4.2 (Analysis of c^*)

Proof of Proposition 1. Since p is determined by c , let us denote p as $p(c)$. By the derivation of $p(c)$, recall that

$$p(c) > c \text{ for all } c > 0 \tag{17}$$

holds. we want to characterize the value of c that satisfies

$$(n+1)(c+1-p(c)) = c+1 \iff p(c) = \frac{n}{n+1}(c+1) \tag{18}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} P(c) &\equiv p(c) - \frac{n}{n+1}(c+1) \\ h(c, p) &\equiv 1 - (p-c)^n - np(p-c)^{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

, then, by the derivation of $p(c)$, $h(c, p(c)) = 0$ holds for all $c > 0$. The implicit function theorem tells us that

$$p'(c) = -\frac{\frac{\partial h(c,p)}{\partial c}}{\frac{\partial h(c,p)}{\partial p}} = 1 - \frac{p-c}{2(p-c) + (n-1)p} \quad (19)$$

Since

$$P'(c) = \left(1 - \frac{p-c}{2(p-c) + (n-1)p}\right) - \frac{n}{n+1} = \frac{c(n-1)}{(n+1)(2(p-c) + (n-1)p)} > 0,$$

$P(c)$ is strictly increasing in $c \in (0, \infty)$. Moreover,

$$P(n) = p(n) - \frac{n}{n+1}(n+1) = p(n) - n > 0 \quad (\because (17))$$

and

$$P(0) = p(0) - \frac{n}{n+1} = \left(\frac{1}{n+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} - \frac{n}{n+1} < 0$$

because

$$\left(\frac{1}{n+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} < \frac{n}{n+1} \iff (n+1)^{n-1} < n^n$$

, which always hold when $n \geq 2$.⁷ Therefore, $P(c) = 0$ has a unique solution c_n^* on $(0, n)$ and $P(c) \leq 0$ holds on $[0, c_n^*]$. Here, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \{c \in (0, n) : P(c) = 0\} &= \{c \in (0, n) : p(c) = \frac{n}{n+1}(c+1)\} \\ &= \{c \in (0, n) : h\left(c, \frac{n}{n+1}(c+1)\right) = 0\} \\ &= \{c \in (0, n) : (n+1)^n - (n-c)^n - n^2(c+1)(n-c)^{n-1} = 0\} \end{aligned}$$

holds where the second equality holds since p was uniquely determined as the solution of $h(c, p) = 0$ on $(c, c+1)$ and $c < \frac{n}{n+1}(c+1) < c+1 \iff c < n$. Thus, c_n^* can be characterized as the unique solution of

$$(n+1)^n - (n-c)^n - n^2(c+1)(n-c)^{n-1} = 0$$

on $(0, n)$, too. □

Proof of Proposition 2. Recall that c_n^* satisfies $(n+1)(c_n^*+1-p(c_n^*)) - (c_n^*+1) = 0$. By implicit function theorem,

$$\frac{dc_n^*}{dn} = -\frac{c+1-p(c)}{(n+1)(1-p'(c)) - 1} = \frac{c+1-p(c)}{(n+1)p'(c) - n}$$

By (19),

$$(n+1)p'(c) - n = (n+1) \left(1 - \frac{p(c)-c}{2(p(c)-c) + (n-1)p(c)}\right) - n = \frac{(n-1)c}{2(p(c)-c) + (n-1)p(c)}$$

Since we have $c < p(c) < c+1$, the denominator and numerator are both positive. Thus, $\frac{dc_n^*}{dn} > 0$. □

Proof of Proposition 3. It suffices to show $c_n^* > \frac{\ln n}{3}$. Since $p(c)$ satisfies $h(c, p(c)) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= (p(c)-c)^n + np(c)(p(c)-c)^{n-1} \\ \implies 1 &> (n+1)(p(c)-c)^n \\ \iff p(c) &< c + \left(\frac{1}{n+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \end{aligned}$$

⁷ $(n+1)^{n-1} < n^n$ holds for all $n \geq 2$. Let $f(x) = x \log x - (x-1) \log(x+1)$. Then $f(2) = \log \frac{4}{3} > 0$. Further, $x \geq 2$, $f'(x) = \frac{2}{x+1} - \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{x}\right) > \frac{1}{x} - \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{x}\right) \geq 0$. Therefore, if $x \geq 2$, $f(x) > 0$.

Thus,

$$P(c) < \frac{1}{n+1}c + \left(\frac{1}{n+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} - \frac{n}{n+1}$$

Here, let $f(n) = n \ln\left(n - \frac{\ln n}{3}\right) - (n-1) \ln(n+1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} f'(n) &= \frac{5n-1+(n-1)\ln n}{(3n-\ln n)(n+1)} - \ln\left(1 + \frac{3+\ln n}{3n-\ln n}\right) \\ &> \frac{2n-4-2\ln n}{(3n-\ln n)(n+1)} \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality holds since $x > \ln(1+x)$ for all $x > 0$. Here, since $2n-4-2\ln n > 0$ holds for all $n \geq 4$, $f(n)$ increases for $n \geq 4$. This and $f(4) > 0^8$ implies $f(n) > 0$ for all $n \geq 4$. But notice that

$$f(n) > 0 \iff \left(n - \frac{\ln n}{3}\right)^n > (n+1)^{n-1} \iff \frac{1}{n+1}c + \left(\frac{1}{n+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} - \frac{n}{n+1} < 0$$

holds. Thus, $P\left(\frac{\ln n}{3}\right) < 0$ for all $n \geq 4$. By proof of proposition 1, it follows that $c_n^* > \frac{\ln n}{3}$ for all $n \geq 4$ \square

7.3 Proof of Proposition5

In this subsection, we will prove the stronger statement of Proposition5. That is, we will prove that we can provide a proper γ if a proper measure is defined on a smaller region instead of considering the entire domain of γ , $[c, c+1]^n$. First, we will introduce an equivalent characterization of the pushed set defined in Definition4 as follows:

Lemma (Lemma 5 restate). For all upper set $U \subset B$ with respect to B and all $y \in W \cup B_Z$

$$y + t\mathbf{1} \in U \cap B \text{ for some } t \in \mathbb{R} \iff y \in \text{push}(U)$$

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Suppose that there exists $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $y + t\mathbf{1} \in U \cap B$. By definition of u^* , there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $u^*(y + t\mathbf{1}) - u^*(y) = y_i + t - y_i = t = \|(y + t\mathbf{1}) - y\|_\infty$. (\Leftarrow) Suppose that there exists $x \in U \cap B$ such that $u^*(x) - u^*(y) = \|x - y\|_\infty$. Take any i such that $x_i = c + 1$. Note that

$$c + 1 - \max(y) = u^*(x) - u^*(y) = \|x - y\|_\infty \geq |x_i - y_i| = c + 1 - y_i.$$

This implies that $y_i = \max(y)$. Let $t = c + 1 - y_i$. Then $y + t\mathbf{1} \in B$ because $\max(y + t\mathbf{1}) = y_i + t = c + 1$. Here, $y + t\mathbf{1} \in U$ because U is an upper set and for any j ,

$$\begin{aligned} y_j + t &\geq (x_j - x_i + y_i) + t \quad (\because x_i - y_i = c + 1 - \max(y) = \|x - y\|_\infty \geq x_j - y_j) \\ &= (x_j - (c + 1) + y_i) + t \\ &= x_j \end{aligned}$$

\square

Let

$$B_i \equiv \{x \in [c, c+1]^n : x_i = c + 1 = \max(x)\}$$

Thus $B = \cup_{i=1}^n B_i$. Then, by above lemma5, notice that the restriction of γ_1 to B_i denoted as $\gamma_1^{B_i}$ can be expressed as follows:

$$\gamma_1(E \cap B_i) = \mu_-(\{x \in [c, c+1]^n | x_i = \max(x) \geq p \text{ and } x + t\mathbf{1} \in E \text{ for some } t \in \mathbb{R}\})$$

for all measurable $E \subset B_i$. Denote $\gamma_1^{B_i}(E) \equiv \gamma_1(E \cap B_i)$. Therefore, equivalent formation of the measure γ_1 is:

$$\gamma_1(E) = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_1^{B_i}(E)$$

for all measurable $E \subset B$. Now we are ready to prove Proposition5. To do that, it suffices to prove the following Proposition6:

⁸Indeed, since $\frac{3}{4} > \ln 2$, $f(4) = 4 \ln\left(4 - \frac{2}{3} \ln 2\right) - 3 \ln 5 > \ln \frac{7^4}{2^4 \cdot 5^3} > 0$

Proposition 6. *It is optimal to sell all items at a certain price if*

$$\gamma_1^{B_1} \succeq_{cvx} \mu|_{B_1},$$

Notice that if we show Proposition 6, then Proposition 5 follows since γ_1 and μ_+ has measure only on $\{(c, \dots, c)\} \cup B$ and by symmetric structure of γ_1 and μ_+ ,

$$\gamma_1^{B_1} \succeq_{cvx} \mu_+|_{B_1} \implies \gamma_1 \succeq_{cvx} \mu_+$$

holds.

Proof of Proposition 6. We will prove the existence of γ which satisfies the above conditions under $u(x) = \max(0, \max(x) - p)$.

The proof is done by dividing $[c, c+1]^n$ into $n+1$ parts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &\equiv [c, p]^n \\ A_i &= \{x \in [c, c+1]^n \mid x_i = \max(x) \geq p\} \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$[c, c+1]^n = \left(\bigcup_{i=0}^n A_i \right)$$

The proof is done if we provide $\gamma^{A_i}, i = 1, \dots, n$ such that γ^{A_i} is defined on $A_i \times A_i$ and

$$\gamma_1^{A_i} - \gamma_2^{A_i} \succeq_{cvx} \mu|_{A_i} \tag{2'}$$

$$\int_{[c, c+1]^n} ud(\gamma_1^{A_i} - \gamma_2^{A_i}) = \int_{[c, c+1]^n} ud\mu|_{A_i} \tag{3'}$$

$$u(x) - u(y) = \|x - y\|_\infty \gamma^{A_i}(x, y)\text{-almost surely} \tag{4'}$$

This is because γ is given using $\gamma^{A_i}, i = 1, \dots, n$ as follows

$$\gamma(F) = \begin{cases} \gamma^{A_i}(F) & \text{if } F \subset A_i \times A_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This γ satisfies (5), (6), (7).

(i) Let us define γ^{A_0} as

$$\gamma^{A_0}(D) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}) \in D \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{c} = (c, \dots, c) \in [c, c+1]^n$. Note that $\gamma^{A_0}(A_0^2) = 0$.

(a) This γ^{A_0} satisfies (2') because

$$\gamma_1^{A_0}(F) - \gamma_2^{A_0}(F) = 0 \geq \mu|_{A_0}(F)$$

for all measurable $F \subset A_0$.

(b) This γ^{A_0} satisfies (3') because $u(x) = 0$ for all $x \in A_0$.

(c) This γ^{A_0} satisfies (4') because $\gamma^{A_0}(F) = 0$ if $(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}) \notin F$.

(ii) Let $\gamma^{A_i}, i = 1, \dots, n$ be the measures which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1^{A_i}(D) &= \gamma_1^{B_i}(D \cap B_i) \\ \gamma_2^{A_i}(D) &= \mu|_{B_i}(D) \end{aligned}$$

for all measurable $D \subset A_i$.

(a) This γ^{A_i} satisfies (2') because

$$\gamma_1^{B_1} \succeq_{cvx} \mu|_{B_1}.$$

(b) This γ^{A_0} satisfies (3') because $u(x)$ is constant for all $x \in B_1$.

(c) This γ^{A_0} satisfies (4') because of the definition of $\gamma_1^{B_1}$.

□

7.4 Proof of Sufficiency of Theorem3

Following on from the previous subsection, we have to seek the condition under which $\gamma_1^{B_1} \succeq_{\text{cvx}} \mu_+|_{B_1}$ holds. Before we do that, we will identify density functions of $\gamma_1^{B_1}$ and $\mu_+|_{B_1}$. It is straightforward that $\mu_+|_{B_1}$'s density is $f_{\mu_+|_{B_1}}(x) \equiv c + 1$. On the other hand, the following lemma11 shows the density of $\gamma_1^{B_1}$ is written as

$$f^{B_1}(x) \equiv \begin{cases} (n+1)(c+1-p) & (x \in [2c+1-p, c+1]^{n-1}) \\ (n+1)(\min(x) - c) + c & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

Lemma 11.

$$\gamma_1^{B_1}(E) = \int_{[c, c+1]^{n-1}} \mathbb{I}_E(c+1, x_{-1}) f^{B_1}(x_{-1}) dx_{-1}$$

for all measurable set $E \subset B_1$.

Proof. Let \mathbb{L} be the set of all rectangles on B_1 , i.e. $\mathbb{L} \equiv \{[c+1] \times [a_2, b_2] \times \cdots \times [a_n, b_n] \subset B_1 : a_2 \leq b_2 \dots a_n \leq b_n\}$ Since product σ -algebra on B_1 is generated by \mathbb{L} , it suffices to show that for each $L \in \mathbb{L}$,

$$\gamma_1^{B_1}(L) = \int_{[c, c+1]^{n-1}} \mathbb{I}_L(c+1, x_{-1}) f^{B_1}(x_{-1}) dx_{-1} \quad (21)$$

holds. Here define \mathbb{L}^* as the set of all rectangles on B_1 which has one corner at $x = (c+1, c, \dots, c)$, i.e. $\mathbb{L}^* \equiv \{[c+1] \times [c, c+l_2] \times \cdots \times [c, c+l_n] : l_2, \dots, l_n \in [0, 1]\}$. Then, notice that each $L = [c+1] \times [a_2, b_2] \times \cdots \times [a_n, b_n] \in \mathbb{L}$ can be expressed as the finite union and intersection of elements of \mathbb{L}^* as follows: if you let $L_0 = [c+1] \times [c, b_2] \times \cdots \times [c, b_n]$ and $L_i = \{x \in B_1 : x_i \in [c, a_i]\}$ for each $i = 2, \dots, n$, then

$$L = L_0 \bigcap (\bigcap_{i=2}^n (B_1 \setminus L_i))$$

Thus, instead of showing (21) for each $L \in \mathbb{L}$, it suffices to show that (21) for each $L = [c+1] \times [c, c+l_2] \times \cdots \times [c, c+l_n] \in \mathbb{L}^*$. By symmetry, we can assume $l_2 \geq l_3 \cdots \geq l_n$ without loss of generality. We will divide it into two cases.

1. When $c+1 - l_n \geq p$

Let

$$L_i \equiv L \cap \{x : x_i = \min(x)\},$$

then, (L_2, \dots, L_n) is a partition of L , i.e. these are mutually disjoint and $L = \cup_{i=2}^n L_i$. Here,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1^{B_1}(L) &= \mu_-(\{x \in [c, c+1]^n | x_1 = \max(x) \geq p, \text{ and } x + t\mathbf{1} \in L \text{ for some } t \in \mathbb{R}\}) \\ &= \int_0^{l_n} (l_2 - t) \cdots (l_n - t)(n+1) dt \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=2}^n \mu_-(\{x \in [c, c+1]^n | x_1 = \max(x) \geq p, x_i = c, \text{ and } x + t\mathbf{1} \in L_i \text{ for some } t \in \mathbb{R}\}) \end{aligned}$$

As for the first term, we can calculate it as

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{l_n} (l_2 - t) \cdots (l_n - t)(n+1) dt \\ &= [t(l_2 - t) \cdots (l_n - t)]_0^{l_n} + \sum_{i=2}^n (n+1) \int_0^{l_n} (l_2 - t) \cdots (l_{i-1} - t)(l_{i+1} - t) \cdots (l_n - t) t dt \\ &= \sum_{i=2}^n (n+1) \int_0^{l_n} (l_2 - t) \cdots (l_{i-1} - t)(l_{i+1} - t) \cdots (l_n - t) t dt \end{aligned}$$

As for the second term, since $L_i = L \cap \{x : x_i = \min(x)\}$, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} &\{x \in [c, c+1]^n | x_1 = \max(x) \geq p, x_i = c, \text{ and } x + t\mathbf{1} \in L_i \text{ for some } t \in \mathbb{R}\} \\ &= \{x \in [c, c+1]^n | x_1 = \max(x) \geq p, x_i = c, \text{ and } x + (c+1 - x_1)\mathbf{1} \in L_i\} \\ &= \bigcup_{u=c+1-l_n}^{c+1} \{x \in [c, c+1]^n | x_1 = u, x_i = c, \text{ and } x + (c+1 - u)\mathbf{1} \in L_i\} \end{aligned}$$

Notice that for each $u \in [c+1-l_n, c+1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \{x + (c+1-u)\mathbf{1} \in L_i : x \in [c, c+1]^n, x_1 = u, x_i = c\} \\ & = \{x \in L_i : x_1 = c+1, x_i = 2c+1-u, x_j \in [2c+1-u, c+l_j] \text{ for all } j \neq i\} \end{aligned}$$

holds. Thus, each component of the second term can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu_-(\{x \in [c, c+1]^n | x_1 = \max(x) \geq p, \text{ and } x+t\mathbf{1} \in L \text{ for some } t \in \mathbb{R}\}) \\ & = \int_{c+1-l_n}^{c+1} \left(\prod_{j \neq 1, i} (c+l_j - (c+1-u) - ((2c+1-u) - (c+1-u))) \right) du \\ & = \int_{c+1-l_n}^{c+1} \left(\prod_{j \neq 1, i} (l_j - (c+1-u)) \right) du \\ & = \int_c^{c+l_n} \prod_{j \neq 1, i} (c+l_j - v) dv \end{aligned}$$

where I changed the variable as $u = -v + 2c + 1$ in the final equation. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[c, c+1]^{n-1}} \mathbb{I}_L(c+1, x_{-1}) f^{B_1}(x_{-1}) dx_{-1} & = \int_L (n+1)(\min(x) - c) + c dx_{-1} \\ & = \sum_{i=2}^n \int_{L_i} (n+1)(\min(x) - c) + c dx_{-1} \\ & = \sum_{i=2}^n \int_{L_i} (n+1)(x_i - c) dx_{-1} + c \int_{L_i} dx_{-1} \end{aligned}$$

As for the first term, for each $i \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{L_i} (n+1)(x_i - c) dx_{-1} & = (n+1) \int_{x_i}^{c+l_2} \cdots \int_{x_i}^{c+l_{i-1}} \int_c^{c+l_n} \int_{x_i}^{c+l_{i+1}} \cdots \int_{x_i}^{c+l_n} (x_i - c) dx_{-1} \\ & = (n+1) \int_0^{l_n} (l_2 - t) \cdots (l_{i-1} - t)(l_{i+1} - t) \cdots (l_n - t) t dt \end{aligned}$$

where I transformed the integrating variable as $x_i = t + c$ in the final equation. As for the second term, since $L_i = L \cap \{x : x_i = \min(x)\}$, for each $i \geq 2$

$$\int_{L_i} dx_{-1} = \int_c^{c+l_n} \prod_{j \neq 1, i} (c+l_j - x_i) dx_i$$

Thus, in this case, we could show (21).

2. When $c+1-l_n < p$

For each $S \subset N_{-1} \equiv \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$, let

$$L_S \equiv \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : x_1 = c+1, x_i \in [c, 2c+1-p] \text{ for all } i \in S \text{ and } x_j \in (2c+1-p, c+l_j] \text{ for all } j \in N_{-1} \setminus S\}$$

then, $(L_S)_{S \subset N_{-1}}$ is a partition of L . To prove (21), it suffices to show

$$\gamma_1^{B_1}(L_\emptyset) = \int_{[c, c+1]^{n-1}} \mathbb{I}_{L_\emptyset}(c+1, x_{-1}) f^{B_1}(x_{-1}) dx_{-1}$$

The reason is as follows: The left-hand side of (21) is

$$\gamma_1^{B_1}(L) = \sum_{S \subset N_{-1}} \gamma_1^{B_1}(L_S)$$

and the right hand side of (21) is

$$\int_{[c, c+1]^{n-1}} \mathbb{I}_L(c+1, x_{-1}) f^{B_1}(x_{-1}) dx_{-1} = \sum_{S \subset N_{-1}} \int_{[c, c+1]^{n-1}} \mathbb{I}_{L_S}(c+1, x_{-1}) f^{B_1}(x_{-1}) dx_{-1}$$

Notice that by the result from case (1),

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_1^{B_1}(L_{N-1}) &= \int_{[c,c+1]^{n-1}} \mathbb{I}_{L_{N-1}}(c+1, x_{-1}) f^{B_1}(x_{-1}) dx_{-1} \\ \gamma_1^{B_1}(L_{N-1}) + \gamma_1^{B_1}(L_S) &= \int_{[c,c+1]^{n-1}} \left(\mathbb{I}_{L_{N-1}}(c+1, x_{-1}) + \mathbb{I}_{L_S}(c+1, x_{-1}) \right) f^{B_1}(x_{-1}) dx_{-1} \\ &\text{for all } S \in 2^{N-1} \setminus \{N-1, \emptyset\}\end{aligned}$$

holds. Thus, to prove (21) it remains to show that

$$\gamma_1^{B_1}(L_\emptyset) = \int_{[c,c+1]^{n-1}} \mathbb{I}_{L_\emptyset}(c+1, x_{-1}) f^{B_1}(x_{-1}) dx_{-1}$$

But each of these are:

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_1^{B_1}(L_\emptyset) &= \mu_-(\{x \in [c, c+1]^n \mid x_1 = \max(x) \geq p, \text{ and } x + t\mathbf{1} \in L_\emptyset \text{ for some } t \in \mathbb{R}\}) \\ &= (c + l_2 - (2c + 1 - p)) \cdots (c + l_n - (2c + 1 - p))(c + 1 - p)(n + 1) \\ &= \int_{[c,c+1]^{n-1}} \mathbb{I}_{L_\emptyset}(c+1, x_{-1}) f^{B_1}(x_{-1}) dx_{-1} \\ &= (c + l_2 - (2c + 1 - p)) \cdots (c + l_n - (2c + 1 - p))(c + 1 - p)(n + 1)\end{aligned}$$

So, we could also show (21) in this case. □

For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define $D_k \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ as follows:

$$D_k \equiv \{x \in [c, c+1]^k : x_1 = c+1 \geq x_2 \geq \cdots \geq x_k\}$$

Using above D_k , consider the restriction of $\gamma_1^{B_1}$ to D_n (denoted as $\gamma_1^{D_n}$) and its corresponding density function (denoted as f^{D_n}) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_1^{D_n} &\equiv \gamma_1^{B_1}|_{D_n} \\ f^{D_n} &\equiv f^{B_1}|_{D_n}\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\gamma_1^{D_n}$ satisfies the condition in Lemma 4 in D_n . Since density functions $f_{\mu_+}|_{B_1}$ and f^{B_1} have symmetric structure, to show $\gamma_1^{B_1} \succeq_{\text{cvx}} \mu_+|_{B_1}$, it suffices to show $\gamma_1^{D_n} \succeq_{\text{cvx}} \mu_+|_{D_n}$. Now we are ready to show the simple condition under which $\gamma_1^{D_n} \succeq_{\text{cvx}} \mu_+|_{D_n}$ holds:

Proposition 7. *For all $n \geq 1$,*

$$\gamma_1^{D_n} \succeq_{\text{cvx}} \mu_+|_{D_n} \iff (n+1)(c+1-p) \geq c+1$$

Proof. \implies part is obvious by considering contraposition. Indeed, suppose $(n+1)(c+1-p) < c+1$. Recall we defined

$$v(x) \equiv \max\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i - (nc + n + c - p), 0\right).$$

Since

$$v(c+1, \dots, c+1, 2c+1-p) = 0,$$

it follows that $v(x) < 0$ whenever $\max(x) < 2c+1-p$, leading to

$$\int_X v d\gamma_1 < \int_X v d\mu_+$$

In particular, we have

$$\int_X v d\mu_+|_{D_n} > \int_X v d\gamma_1^{D_n}.$$

Since $v \in \mathcal{U}(X)$, $\gamma_1^{D_n} \succeq_{\text{cvx}} \mu_+|_{D_n}$ doesn't hold.

\longleftarrow part will be shown by the following Proposition 8 □

Definition 7. For $k \geq 2$ and $X \subset \mathbb{R}^{k-1}$, we say the function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is **X-ordered** if it satisfies the following two conditions:

- $f(x) = f(x')$ if $\min(x) = \min(x')$
- there exists $r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(x)(\min(x) - r) \geq 0$ for all $x \in X$

Proposition 8. Let α be a signed measure on X with a density function f . If f is X -ordered and $\alpha(X) \geq 0$, then $\alpha \succeq_{cvx} 0$.

Proposition 8 is stronger than the \Leftarrow part of Proposition 7 because $\gamma_1^{D_n} - \mu_+|_{D_n}$ has a density function, and its density function is D_n -ordered if $(n+1)(c+1-p) \geq (c+1)$ by following lemma:

Lemma 12. If $(n+1)(c+1-p) \geq (c+1)$, the density function of $\gamma_1^{D_n} - \mu_+|_{D_n}$ is D_n -ordered

Proof. The first condition is straightforward because f^{D_n} depends only on $\min(x)$ and $f_{\mu_+}|_{D_n}$ is constant. The second condition is also satisfied. Let $r \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy

$$(n+1)(r-c) + c = c+1,$$

which means $r = \frac{1}{n+1} + c$. Then $(f^{D_n} - f_{\mu_+}|_{D_n})(x)(\min(x) - r) \geq 0$ for all $x \in D_n$ as follows:

1. If $x \in \{c+1\} \times [2c+1-p, c+1]^{n-1}$, $(f^{D_n} - f_{\mu_+}|_{D_n})(x)(\min(x) - r) = ((n+1)(c+1-p) - (c+1))(\min(x) - r)$. Since we assume $(n+1)(c+1-p) \geq (c+1)$,

$$(2c+1-p) - r = (2c+1-p) - \left(\frac{1}{n+1} + c\right) = \frac{(n+1)(c+1-p) - (c+1)}{n+1} \geq 0.$$

Then $(2c+1-p) \geq r$. Therefore, $((n+1)(c+1-p) - (c+1))(\min(x) - r) \geq 0$ for all $x \in [2c+1-p, c+1]^{n-1}$.

2. If $x \in D_n \setminus \{c+1\} \times [2c+1-p, c+1]^{n-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (f^{D_n} - f_{\mu_+}|_{D_n})(x)(\min(x) - r) &= ((n+1)(\min(x) - c) - (c+1))(\min(x) - r) \\ &= (n+1)(\min(x) - r)^2 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

by definition of r .

Therefore, $(f^{D_n} - f_{\mu_+}|_{D_n})(x)(\min(x) - r) \geq 0$ for all $x \in D_n$. Thus, $f^{D_n} - f_{\mu_+}|_{D_n}$ is D_n -ordered. \square

To prove Proposition 8, we will first introduce the sufficient condition of convex dominance.

Lemma 13 (Shaked and Shanthikumar (2007), section 6.B.1). For $k \geq 2$ and $D \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, let ν and η be the signed measure supported within D . Then $\nu \succeq_{cvx} \eta$ if $\int \mathbb{I}_U(x) d\nu \geq \int \mathbb{I}_U(x) d\eta$ for all upper set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$.

Thus, to show $\alpha \succeq_{cvx} 0$, we will show $\int \mathbb{I}_U(x) d\alpha \geq 0$ for all upper set $U \subset D_n$. we will use mathematical induction to prove Proposition 8. Before proceeding to the proof of Proposition 8, we introduce two lemmas useful for conducting induction.

Lemma 14. For $k \geq 3$, $c \geq 0$, and k -dimensional euclidean space, consider integrable function $f : D_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Here, define the function on $(k-1)$ -dimensional space; $g : D_{k-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given as $g(x) \equiv \int_c^{x_{k-1}} f dx_k$. If f is D_k -ordered, then g is D_{k-1} -ordered.

Proof. Take any $x, x' \in D_{k-1}$ with $x_{k-1} = x'_{k-1}$, then since f is D_k -ordered,

$$g(x) = \int_c^{x_{k-1}} f(x, x_k) dx_k = \int_c^{x'_{k-1}} f(x', x_k) dx_k = g(x').$$

The first condition is proved.

Let $r \in \mathbb{R}$ be a number such that $f(x)(x_k - r) \geq 0$ for all $x \in D_k$. Note that we can further assume such r to

be in $[c, c+1]$. Take any $x \in D_k$ with $x_{k-1} \in [c, r]$; then since $x_k < r$, $g(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}) = \int_c^{x_{k-1}} f dx_k \leq 0$. Take any $x', x'' \in D_k$ with $x''_{k-1} > x'_{k-1} \geq r$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & g(x''_1, \dots, x''_{k-1}) - g(x'_1, \dots, x'_{k-1}) \\ &= \int_c^{x''_{k-1}} f(x''_1, \dots, x''_{k-1}, x_k) dx_k - \int_c^{x'_{k-1}} f(x'_1, \dots, x'_{k-1}, x_k) dx_k \\ &= \int_{x'_{k-1}}^{x''_{k-1}} f(x''_1, \dots, x''_{k-1}, x_k) dx_k \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $g(x)$ is increasing on $x_{k-1} \in [r, c+1]$. From the above two cases, it follows that there exists $r' \in \mathbb{R}$, $g(x)(x_{k-1} - r') \geq 0$ for all $x \in D_{k-1}$. \square

Definition 8. 1. For any $V \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, the cylinder of V , $cy(V)$, is defined as

$$cy(V) \equiv \{(x_{-n}, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_{-n} \in V\}$$

2. Let f be X -ordered. For any $V \subset X$, the cylinder of V by f , $cy(V, f)$, is defined as

$$cy(V, f) \equiv \{(x_{-n}, x_n) \in D : (x_{-n}, r) \in V\},$$

where r is determined by the second condition of Definition 7.

Lemma 15. A signed measure α on X is X -ordered if α has a density function $f : D_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and f is D_n -ordered. For any upper set $U \subset D_n$, $\alpha(cy(U, f)) \leq \alpha(U)$.

Proof. Since f is D_n -ordered, there exists $r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(x)(\min(x) - r) \geq 0$ for all $x \in D_n$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} U^+ &\equiv \{x \in U_n : \min(x) \geq r\} \\ U^- &\equiv \{x \in U_n : \min(x) \leq r\} \\ cy(U, f)^+ &\equiv \{x \in cy(U, f) : \min(x) \geq r\} \\ cy(U, f)^- &\equiv \{x \in cy(U, f) : \min(x) \leq r\} \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to prove that

$$cy(U, f)^+ \subset U^+ \text{ and } U^- \subset cy(U, f)^-.$$

First, we will prove that $cy(U, f)^+ \subset U^+$. Take any $x \in cy(U, f)^+$. By definition of the cylinder, $(x_{-n}, r) \in U$. The definition of $cy(U, f)^+$ implies that $\min(x) \geq r$. Since $x \in cy(U) \subset D_n$, $\min(x) = x_n$. Therefore, $(x_{-n}, r) \leq x$ coordinate-wise. By definition of the upper set, $x \in U$.

Second, we will prove $U^- \subset cy(U, f)^-$. Take any $x \in U^-$. Since $x_n = \min(x) \leq r$, $(x_{-n}, r) \in U$. By definition of $cy(U)$, $x \in cy(U, f)$. Since $\min(x) \leq r$, $x \in cy(U, f)^-$. Therefore, the above statement is true. Since $f(x) \geq 0$ if $\min(x) \geq r$ and $f(x) \leq 0$ if $\min(x) < r$, $\alpha(cy(U, f)^+) \geq \alpha(U^+)$ and $\alpha(cy(U, f)^-) \geq \alpha(U^-)$. Therefore,

$$\alpha(cy(U, f)) = \alpha(cy(U, f)^+) + \alpha(cy(U, f)^-) \leq \alpha(U^+) + \alpha(U^-) = \alpha(U)$$

\square

Using Lemma 14 and 15, we will complete the proof of Proposition 8. We will prove Proposition 8 by induction.

Proof. 1. When $n = 0$, the domain of α , X , is a singleton. Since $\alpha(X) \geq 0$, $\alpha \succeq_{cvx} 0$.

2. Suppose that $\alpha \succeq_{cvx} 0$ holds for $n = k$. We will prove that this is also true when $n = k + 1$. By Lemma 13, it suffices to prove $\alpha(U) \geq 0$ for all upper set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$. By Lemma 14, $g : D_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$g(x) \equiv \int_c^{x_k} f(x) dx_{k+1}$$

is D_k -ordered. Based on the induction hypothesis, $g \succeq_{cvx} 0$. Then,

$$\int_U g(x)dx \geq 0$$

for all upper set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$. Note that

$$\int_U g(x)dx = \int_U \int_c^{x_k} f(x)dx_{k+1}dx_{-(k+1)} = \int_{cy(U)} f(x)dx = \alpha(cy(U)) \geq 0.$$

By Lemma 15, $\alpha(U) \geq \alpha(cy(U)) \geq 0$. Therefore, $\alpha \succeq_{cvx} 0$. □

Then, \Leftarrow part of Proposition7 is proven as a corollary of Proposition 8.

7.5 Proof of Necessity of Theorem3

Theorem (Theorem 4 restate). *Let $c > c^*$. There doesn't exist $\delta \in \Gamma_+(X \times X)$ such that*

$$\mu_+(X) = \delta_1(X) = \delta_2(X), \tag{9}$$

$$\delta_1 \succeq_{cvx} \mu_+, \tag{10}$$

$$\mu_- \succeq_{cvx} \delta_2, \tag{11}$$

$$u^*(x) - u^*(y) = \|x - y\|_\infty \delta(x, y)\text{-almost surely}, \tag{12}$$

$$\int_X u^*d(\delta_1 - \delta_2) = \int_X u^*d\mu. \tag{13}$$

To prove this theorem, we establish the following lemmas. Recall that

$$W \equiv \{x \in X : \max(x) \in (p, c + 1]\}$$

$$Z \equiv \{x \in X : \max(x) \in [c, p]\}$$

$$B \equiv \{x \in X : \max(x) = c + 1\}$$

$$B_Z \equiv \{x \in X : \max(x) = p\}$$

Lemma (Lemma 6 restate). Suppose that there exists $\delta \in \Gamma_+(X \times X)$ that satisfies (10), (11) and (13). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X u^*d\delta_1 &= \int_X u^*d\mu_+, \\ \int_X u^*d\delta_2 &= \int_X u^*d\mu_-. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since u^* is continuous, non-decreasing, and convex, (10) and (11) mean

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X u^*d\delta_1 &\geq \int_X u^*d\mu_+, \\ \int_X u^*d\delta_2 &\leq \int_X u^*d\mu_-. \end{aligned}$$

Here, (13) implies that both inequalities hold with equality. □

Lemma (Lemma7 restate). Suppose that there exists $\delta \in \Gamma_+(X \times X)$ that satisfies (9), (10), (11) and, (13).

$$\delta_1(Z) = \mu_+(Z)$$

$$\delta_1(B) = \mu_+(B)$$

In particular, the second equation and (9) implies that δ_1 that satisfies (9), (10), (11) and, (13) has measure only on $Z \cup B$.

Proof. $\mu_+(B) \geq \delta_1(B)$ follows from

$$\begin{aligned}
(c+1-p)\mu_+(B) &= \int_B u^* d\mu_+ \\
&= \left(\int_X u^* d\delta_1 - \int_X u^* d\mu_+ \right) + \int_B u^* d\mu_+ \quad (\because \text{Lemma 6}) \\
&= \int_X u^* d\delta_1 - \int_{X \setminus B} u^* d\mu_+ \\
&\geq \int_B u d\delta_1 \quad \left(\because \int_{X \setminus B} u^* d\mu_+ = 0 \right) \\
&= (c+1-p)\delta_1(B).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we will prove $\mu_+(B) \leq \delta_1(B)$. Let $h_t(x) \equiv \max(t \max(x) - t(c+1) + 1, 0)$, where $t > 0$. Then, $h_t \leq 1$ for all $t > 0$, and h_t pointwise converges to

$$h(x) \equiv \begin{cases} 1 & (x \in B) \\ 0 & (x \in X \setminus B). \end{cases}$$

Notice that h_t is a maximum of finite affine functions for each $t > 0$. Thus, $h_t \in \mathcal{U}(X)$ and by (10),

$$\int_X h_t d\delta_1 \geq \int_X h_t d\mu_+.$$

By the bounded convergence theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_X h_t d\delta_1 &= \int_X h d\delta_1 = \delta_1(B) \\
\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_X h_t d\mu_+ &= \int_X h d\mu_+ = \mu_+(B)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mu_+(B) \leq \delta_1(B)$. Thus, we obtain $\delta_1(B) = \mu_+(B)$.

Next, we will prove that $\delta_1(Z) = \mu_+(Z)$. By $\delta_1(B) = \mu_+(B)$ and Lemma 6,

$$\int_{W \setminus B} u^* d\delta_1 = \int_X u^* d\delta_1 - \int_B u^* d\delta_1 = \int_X u^* d\mu_+ - \int_B u^* d\mu_+ = \int_{W \setminus B} u^* d\mu_+ = 0$$

This implies that $u^* = 0$ δ_1 -almost surely in $W \setminus B$, which means that $\delta_1(W \setminus B) = 0$. Therefore,

$$\delta_1(Z) = \delta_1(X) - \delta_1(W \setminus B) - \delta_1(B) = \mu_+(X) - \mu_+(W \setminus B) - \mu_+(B) = \mu_+(Z)$$

□

Lemma (Lemma 8 restate). Suppose that there exists $\delta \in \Gamma_+(X \times X)$ that satisfies (12). Then the following two equations hold:

$$\delta_1(Z \setminus B_Z) = \delta_2(Z \setminus B_Z)$$

$$\delta_1(U \cap W) \leq \delta_2(\text{push}(U) \cap W) + (\delta_2 - \delta_1)(\text{push}(U) \cap B_Z) \text{ for all upper set } U \subset B \text{ with respect to } B.$$

Proof. Let $S_{u^*} \equiv \{(x, y) \in X \times X | u(x) - u(y) = \|x - y\|_\infty\}$ and $T_{u^*} = (X \times X) \setminus S_{u^*}$. According to (12), $\delta(T_{u^*}) = 0$. Note that for all $P, Q \subset X$,

$$\begin{aligned}
[x \in P \Rightarrow y \in Q \text{ for all } (x, y) \in S_{u^*}] &\Rightarrow \delta_1(P) \leq \delta_2(Q) \\
[x \in P \iff y \in Q \text{ for all } (x, y) \in S_{u^*}] &\Rightarrow \delta_1(P) = \delta_2(Q)
\end{aligned}$$

This is because, if $x \in P \Rightarrow y \in Q$ for all $(x, y) \in S_{u^*}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_1(P) &= \delta(P \times X) \\
&= \delta(P \times Q) + \delta(P \times (X \setminus Q)) \\
&= \delta(P \times Q) (\because P \times (X \setminus Q) \subset T_{u^*} \text{ and (12)}) \\
&\leq \delta(X \times Q) \\
&= \delta_2(Q).
\end{aligned}$$

We obtain the second statement by repeating the above discussion twice.

First, we will prove that for all $(x, y) \in S_{u^*}$,

$$x \in Z \setminus B_Z \iff y \in Z \setminus B_Z \quad (22)$$

- If $x \in Z \setminus B_Z$, $u^*(x) = 0$. Then, $\|x - y\|_\infty = 0$ because

$$0 \geq 0 - u^*(y) = u^*(x) - u^*(y) = \|x - y\|_\infty \geq 0.$$

Thus, $y = x \in Z \setminus B_Z$.

- Suppose that $x \notin Z \setminus B_Z$ and $y \in Z \setminus B_Z$. We will prove that $(x, y) \notin S_{u^*}$. Since $x \in W \cup B_Z$, by definition of u^* , $u^*(x) - u^*(y) = (\max(x) - p) - 0 = \max(x) - p$. Take any $i^* \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $x_{i^*} = \max(x)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - y\|_\infty &\geq |x_{i^*} - y_{i^*}| \\ &= x_{i^*} - y_{i^*} \quad (\because x_{i^*} \geq p > y_{i^*}) \\ &> \max(x) - p \quad (\because y_{i^*} < p) \\ &= u^*(x) - u^*(y). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $(x, y) \notin S_{u^*}$.

These discussions prove that for all $(x, y) \in S_{u^*}$, $x \in Z \setminus B_Z \iff y \in Z \setminus B_Z$. Therefore, $\delta_1(Z \setminus B_Z) = \delta_2(Z \setminus B_Z)$.

Second, we will prove that

$$\delta_1(U \cap W) + \delta_1(\text{push}(U) \cap B_Z) \leq \delta_2(\text{push}(U) \cap W) + \delta_2(\text{push}(U) \cap B_Z)$$

for all upper sets $U \subset B$ with respect to B . It suffices to prove that; for all $(x, y) \in S_{u^*}$,

$$x \in (U \cap W) \cup (\text{push}(U) \cap B_Z) \Rightarrow y \in (\text{push}(U) \cap W) \cup (\text{push}(U) \cap B_Z)$$

Assume that $x \in (U \cap W) \cup (\text{push}(U) \cap B_Z)$ and $u^*(x) - u^*(y) = \|x - y\|_\infty$.

- Suppose that $x \in U \cap W$. By (22), $x \in W$ implies that $y \notin Z \setminus B_Z$, which means that $y \in W \cup B_Z$. By definition of $\text{push}(U)$, $y \in \text{push}(U)$. Thus,

$$y \in (\text{push}(U) \cap W) \cup (\text{push}(U) \cap B_Z).$$

- If $x \in \text{push}(U) \cap B_Z$, $u(x) = 0$. Then, $\|x - y\|_\infty = 0$ as we have discussed earlier, and $y = x \in \text{push}(U) \cap B_Z$.

This completes the proof. □

Definition (Definition6 restate). For a bounded function $f : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $f_{\text{push}} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$f_{\text{push}}(x) = f(x + t\mathbf{1}), \text{ where } t = c + 1 - \max(x).$$

Lemma (Lemma 9 restate). Suppose that $c > c^*$ and there exists $\delta \in \Gamma_+(X \times X)$ that satisfies (9), (10), (11), (12) and (13). Then, for all nonnegative, bounded and nondecreasing functions $f : B \rightarrow [0, \infty)$,

$$\int_W f d\gamma_1 = \int_W f_{\text{push}} d\mu_-, \quad (15)$$

$$\int_W f d\delta_1 \leq \int_W f_{\text{push}} d\delta_2 + \int_{B_Z} f_{\text{push}} d(\delta_2 - \delta_1). \quad (16)$$

Proof. Suppose that $b < M$ for some $M > 0$. For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, define $(U_i^m)_{i=1}^m \subset X$ as

$$U_i^m \equiv \left\{ x \in X : b(x) \geq \frac{M \cdot i}{m} \right\}.$$

Note that $U_i^m \subset B$ is an upper set with respect to B for all m and i . Let $b^m : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $b_p^m : W \cup B_Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as

$$b^m(x) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{M}{m} \mathbb{I}(x \in U_i^m),$$

$$b_p^m(x) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{M}{m} \mathbb{I}(x \in \text{push}(U_i^m)).$$

Then, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sup_{x \in B} |b^m - b| \leq \frac{M}{m},$$

$$\sup_{x \in W \cup B_Z} |b_p^m - b_{\text{push}}| \leq \frac{M}{m}.$$

This is because for all $x \in B$, there exists $i = 1 \dots, m$ such that $\frac{M}{m}(i-1) \leq b(x) < \frac{M}{m}i$. By definition of b^m , $b^m(x) = \frac{M}{m}(i-1)$. Hence, $|b(x) - b^m(x)| \leq \frac{M}{m}$.

Likewise, take any $x \in W \cup B_Z$. Since $b_{\text{push}} < M$, there exists $i = 1 \dots, m$ such that

$$\frac{M}{m}(i-1) \leq b_{\text{push}}(x) < \frac{M}{m}i.$$

By definition of b_{push} ,

$$\frac{M}{m}(i-1) \leq b(x+t\mathbf{1}) < \frac{M}{m}i, \text{ where } t = c+1 - \max(x).$$

We have $x+t\mathbf{1} \in U_{i-1}^m \cap B$ and $x+t\mathbf{1} \notin U_i^m \cap B$. By Lemma 5,

$$x \in \text{push}(U_i^m) \setminus \text{push}(U_{i+1}^m),$$

By definition of b_p^m , $b_p^m(x) = \frac{M}{m}(i-1)$ holds. Thus, we obtain $|b_{\text{push}}(x) - b_p^m(x)| \leq \frac{M}{m}$. Therefore, b^m uniformly converges to b on B , and b_p^m uniformly converges to b_{push} on $W \cup B_Z$. First, we will prove (15). Note that $\gamma_1(U) = \mu_-(\text{push}(U))$ for all upper set $U \subset B$. Then, by the definition of b^m, b_p^m ,

$$\int_B b^m d\gamma_1 = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{M}{m} \gamma_1(U_i^m) = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{M}{m} \mu_-(\text{push}(U_i^m)) = \int_W b^m d\mu_-$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_W b(x) d\gamma_1 &= \int_B b(x) d\gamma_1 \quad (\because \text{by (9) and Lemma 7, } \gamma_1 \text{ has measure only on } Z \cup B) \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_B b^m d\gamma_1 \quad (\because b^m \text{ uniformly converges to } b) \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_W b_p^m d\mu_- \\ &= \int_W b_{\text{push}}(x) d\mu_- \quad (\because b_p^m \text{ uniformly converges to } b_{\text{push}}) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\int_W b(x) d\gamma_1 = \int_W b_{\text{push}}(x) d\mu_-$. Second, we will prove (16). Lemma 8 implies that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B b^m d\delta_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{M}{m} \delta_1(U_i^m \cap B) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{M}{m} \delta_1(U_i^m \cap W) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{M}{m} (\delta_2(\text{push}(U_i^m) \cap W) + (\delta_2 - \delta_1)(\text{push}(U_i^m) \cap B_Z)) \quad (\because \text{Lemma 8}) \\ &= \int_W b_p^m d\delta_2 + \int_{B_Z} b_p^m d(\delta_2 - \delta_1) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_W b(x)d\delta_1 &= \int_B b(x)d\delta_1 \quad (\because \text{by (9) and Lemma 7, } \delta_1 \text{ has measure only on } Z \cup B) \\
&= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_B b^m d\delta_1 \\
&\leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_W b_p^m d\delta_2 + \int_{B_Z} b_p^m d(\delta_2 - \delta_1) \right) \\
&= \int_W b_{push}(x)d\delta_2 + \int_{B_Z} b_{push}(x)d(\delta_2 - \delta_1).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma (Lemma10 restate). Suppose that $c > c^*$ and there exists $\delta \in \Gamma_+(X \times X)$ that satisfies (9), (10), (11), (12) and (13). Then $\delta_1 \succeq_{cvx} \mu_+$ does not hold.

Proof. Recall we defined $v : X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ as

$$v(x) \equiv \max \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i - (nc + n + c - p), 0 \right)$$

and let $\tilde{v} : B \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be the restriction of v to B , i.e. $\tilde{v} \equiv v|_B$. Define $v_t : X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ as

$$v_t(x) \equiv \max(\tilde{v}_{push}(x) + (n+t)(\max(x) - p), 0)$$

for $t > 0$. Note that $\tilde{v}_{push} : X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is

$$\tilde{v}_{push}(x) = \max \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i + (p - c) - n \max(x), 0 \right)$$

So that

$$\tilde{v}_{push}(x) + (n+t)(\max(x) - p) = \max \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i - c - (n-1)p, n(\max(x) - p) \right) + t(\max(x) - p)$$

Since the pointwise maximum of affine functions is convex and all affine terms are non-decreasing, their sum remains convex. Thus, v_t is in $\mathcal{U}(X)$ and by (11),

$$\int_X v_t d(\mu_- - \delta_2) \geq 0$$

for all $t > 0$. By $v_t(x) = \tilde{f}_{push}(x) + (n+t)u^*(x)$ for $x \in W \cup B_Z$ and Lemma 6

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \int_X v_t d(\mu_- - \delta_2) \\
&= \int_{W \cup B_Z} v_t d(\mu_- - \delta_2) + \int_{Z \setminus B_Z} v_t d(\mu_- - \delta_2) \\
&= \int_{W \cup B_Z} \tilde{v}_{push} d(\mu_- - \delta_2) + \int_{Z \setminus B_Z} v_t d(\mu_- - \delta_2) \quad (\because \text{Lemma 6})
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mu_-(B_Z) = 0$ and $v \geq 0$,

$$\int_{B_Z} \tilde{v}_{push} d(\mu_- - \delta_2) = \int_{B_Z} \tilde{v}_{push} d(-\delta_2) \leq \int_{B_Z} \tilde{v}_{push} d(\delta_1 - \delta_2)$$

Moreover, by (15) and (16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{W \cup B_Z} \tilde{v}_{push} d(\mu_- - \delta_2) &= \int_W \tilde{v}_{push} d(\mu_- - \delta_2) + \int_{B_Z} \tilde{v}_{push} d(\mu_- - \delta_2) \\
&\leq \int_W \tilde{v}_{push} d(\mu_- - \delta_2) + \int_{B_Z} \tilde{v}_{push} d(\delta_1 - \delta_2) \\
&\leq \int_W \tilde{v}_{push} d(\mu_- - \delta_2) + \int_W \tilde{v}_{push} d\delta_2 - \int_W \tilde{v} d\delta_1 \quad (\because (16)) \\
&= \int_W \tilde{v} d(\gamma_1 - \delta_1) \quad (\because (15))
\end{aligned}$$

Here, since $v(x) = 0$ for $x \in Z \cup B_Z$ and both of γ_1 and δ_1 have measure only on $Z \cup B$ (\because (9) and Lemma7), we have

$$\int_X vd(\gamma_1 - \delta_1) = \int_B vd(\gamma_1 - \delta_1) = \int_W \tilde{v}d(\gamma_1 - \delta_1)$$

Therefore, for all $t > 0$,

$$0 \leq \int_X vd(\gamma_1 - \delta_1) + \int_{Z \setminus B_Z} v_t d(\mu_- - \delta_2)$$

By the definition of $v_t(x)$, notice that for all $x \in Z \setminus B_Z$, $v_t(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, by the bounded convergence theorem.

$$0 \leq \int_X vd(\gamma_1 - \delta_1) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_{Z \setminus B_Z} v_t d(\mu_- - \delta_2) = \int_X vd(\gamma_1 - \delta_1)$$

Therefore,

$$\int_X vd\gamma_1 \geq \int_X vd\delta_1$$

Since $c > c^*$ implies $(n+1)(c+1-p) < c+1$, by (14) recall we have

$$\int_X vd\mu_+ > \int_X vd\gamma_1.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\int_X vd\mu_+ > \int_X vd\delta_1.$$

Since $v \in \mathcal{U}(X)$, $\delta_1 \succeq_{cvx} \mu_+$ doesn't hold.

□

By the above lemmas, Theorem 4 is proved.

References

- Cai, Y., Devanur, N. R., & Weinberg, S. M. (2016). A duality based unified approach to bayesian mechanism design. *Proceedings of the forty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of Computing*, 926–939.
- Conitzer, V., & Sandholm, T. (2002). Complexity of mechanism design. *arXiv preprint cs/0205075*.
- Daskalakis, C., Deckelbaum, A., & Tzamos, C. (2017). Strong duality for a multiple-good monopolist by strong duality. *Econometrica*, 85(3), 735–767.
- Dütting, P., Feng, Z., Narasimhan, H., Parkes, D. C., & Ravindranath, S. S. (2023). Optimal auctions through deep learning: Advances in differentiable economics. *Journal of the ACM*.
- Feng, Z., Narasimhan, H., & Parkes, D. C. (2018). Deep learning for revenue-optimal auctions with budgets. *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, 354–362.
- Giannakopoulos, Y. (2015). Bounding the optimal revenue of selling multiple goods. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 581, 83–96.
- Giannakopoulos, Y., & Koutsoupias, E. (2018). Duality and optimality of auctions for uniform distributions. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 47(1), 121–165.
- Haghpanah, N., & Hartline, J. (2021). When is pure bundling optimal? *The Review of Economic Studies*, 88(3), 1127–1156.
- Kash, I. A., & Frongillo, R. M. (2016). Optimal auctions with restricted allocations. *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, 215–232.
- Kolesnikov, A. V., Sandomirskiy, F., Tsyvinski, A., & Zimin, A. P. (2022). Beckmann’s approach to multi-item multi-bidder auctions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.06837*.
- Manelli, A. M., & Vincent, D. R. (2007). Multidimensional mechanism design: Revenue maximization and the multiple-good monopoly. *Journal of Economic theory*, 137(1), 153–185.
- Mas-Colell, A., Whinston, M. D., Green, J. R., et al. (1995). *Microeconomic theory* (Vol. 1). Oxford university press New York.
- Myerson, R. B. (1981). Optimal auction design. *Mathematics of operations research*, 6(1), 58–73.
- Palfrey, T. R. (1983). Bundling decisions by a multiproduct monopolist with incomplete information. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 463–483.
- Pavlov, G. (2011). Optimal mechanism for selling two goods. *The BE Journal of Theoretical Economics*, 11(1), 0000102202193517041664.
- Rochet, J. (1985). The taxation principle and multi-time hamilton-jacobi equations. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 14(2), 113–128.
- Shaked, M., & Shanthikumar, J. G. (2007). *Stochastic orders*. Springer.
- Thirumulanathan, D., Sundaresan, R., & Narahari, Y. (2019). On optimal mechanisms in the two-item single-buyer unit-demand setting. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 82, 31–60.
- Weiran, S., Tang, P., & Zuo, S. (2019). Automated mechanism design via neural networks, 215–223.
- Yang, F. (2023). Nested bundling.
- Yao, A. C.-C. (2017). Dominant-strategy versus bayesian multi-item auctions: Maximum revenue determination and comparison, 3–20.