

FAIR AND EFFICIENT ALLOCATION OF INDIVISIBLE ITEMS UNDER CATEGORY CONSTRAINTS

AYUMI IGARASHI AND FRÉDÉRIC MEUNIER

ABSTRACT. We study the problem of fairly allocating indivisible items under category constraints. Specifically, there are n agents and m indivisible items which are partitioned into categories with associated capacities. An allocation is considered feasible if each bundle satisfies the capacity constraints of its respective categories. For the case of two agents, Shoshan et al. (2023) recently developed a polynomial-time algorithm to find a Pareto-optimal allocation satisfying a relaxed version of envy-freeness, called EF[1, 1]. In this paper, we extend the result of Shoshan et al. to n agents, proving the existence of a Pareto-optimal allocation where each agent can be made envy-free by reallocating at most $n(n - 1)$ items. Furthermore, we present a polynomial-time algorithm to compute such an allocation when the number n of agents is constant.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Fair and efficient allocations of indivisible items. Fair allocation of resources is a fundamental societal problem that has attracted significant attention from the economics literature. The challenge of balancing efficiency and fairness in resource allocation has been one of the central focus in the literature. In the context of divisible resources, these seemingly conflicting objectives can, in fact, be compatible. For a broad class of utility functions, an allocation that satisfies both Pareto-optimality as an efficiency criterion and envy-freeness as a fairness criterion is guaranteed to exist [15]. Moreover, for linear non-negative utilities, such an allocation can be achieved by maximizing the *Nash welfare*, i.e., the product of agents' utilities, as shown by Eisenberg and Gale [8].

In the allocation of indivisible resources—such as assigning time slots to employees or courses to students—envy-freeness is not always attainable. To address this limitation, Budish [4] introduced the notion of EF1, a relaxation of envy-freeness. A striking result, recently proven by Caragiannis et al. [5], establishes a discrete analogue of Eisenberg and Gale: in the case of items yielding non-negative utilities (i.e., goods), an indivisible allocation that maximizes the Nash welfare satisfies both PO and EF1, provided that agents have additive utilities. Further, such an allocation can be found in pseudo-polynomial time [2]. However, when items yield negative utilities (i.e., chores), even the question of existence remains unresolved.

In many real-world applications, allocations must account for constraints. For example, when assigning tasks among employees or allocating courses to students, it is crucial to respect limitations such as maximum working hours or course capacity constraints. A particularly relevant class of constraints in these scenarios is category constraints, recently studied by Dror et al. [7] and Shoshan et al. [13], where items are partitioned into disjoint categories, and each agent can receive at most a certain number of items from each category.

The addition of such constraints increases the complexity of the allocation problem, making it more challenging to achieve both efficiency and fairness. Indeed, Dror et al. [7] observed that unlike the unconstrained setting, maximizing the product of utilities may fail to satisfy EF1 even when two agents have binary additive utilities; see Example 3 in their paper. A similar example actually shows that maximizing Nash welfare may fail to achieve EF k , defined as an allocation where the envy is required to disappear after removing at most k items; see the construction in the proof of Theorem 5 by Cookson et al. [6]. Shoshan et al. [13] provided an example where no allocation satisfies both Pareto-optimality and EF1 under category constraints when agents have positive or negative utilities for the items. Nevertheless, they demonstrated that a feasible allocation satisfying Pareto-optimality and EF[1, 1] (a relaxation of EF1) exists and can be efficiently computed for two agents.

Key words and phrases. Resource allocation; approximate envy-freeness; indivisible items.

In this paper, we study fair allocation of indivisible items under category constraints. Our goal is to find a feasible allocation that is simultaneously efficient and approximately fair. Specifically, we build on the setting of Shoshan, Segal-Halevi, and Hazan [13]. There are n agents and m items. Each agent $i \in [n]$ has a utility function $u_i: [m] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ over the items. For a set S of items, we write $u_i(S) = \sum_{j \in S} u_i(j)$. An *allocation* $A = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)$ is an ordered partition of the items, i.e., $A_i \cap A_{i'} = \emptyset$ for every distinct pair of agents i, i' and $\bigcup_{i \in [n]} A_i = [m]$. The items are moreover partitioned into categories S_h associated with capacities s_h for $h \in [k]$. An allocation A is *feasible* if $|A_i \cap S_h| \leq s_h$ for every agent i and category h . We assume throughout the paper that $|S_h| \leq ns_h$ for every $h \in [k]$ to ensure the existence of at least one feasible allocation. An allocation A is *Pareto-optimal* if it is feasible and if there is no feasible allocation A' such that $u_i(A'_i) \geq u_i(A_i)$ for every agent i and $u_{i'}(A'_{i'}) > u_{i'}(A_{i'})$ for at least one agent i' . An agent i *envies* an agent i' if $u_i(A_{i'}) > u_i(A_i)$.

1.2. Main results. The case $n = 2$ of the following theorem is the main result of Shoshan, Segal-Halevi, and Hazan. We generalize this result for all n .

Theorem 1. *For every number n of agents, there exists a Pareto-optimal allocation with a subset of $n(n-1)$ items such that for every agent, it is possible to reallocate some items in the subset so as to get a Pareto-optimal allocation making the agent non-envy-free.*

This implies the result of Shoshan et al., which establishes the existence of a Pareto-optimal and EF[1,1] allocation among two agents, as we can reduce the problem to the case where feasible allocations assign s_h items from each category to every agent. Specifically, an allocation A satisfies *envy-freeness up one good and one chore* (EF[1,1]) if for every pair of agents i, i' , there exist sets $S \subseteq A_i$ and $T \subseteq A_{i'}$ of size at most 1 such that $u_i(A_i \setminus S) \geq u_i(A_{i'} \setminus T)$. Suppose that there are two Pareto-optimal allocations A and A' for two agents that can be transformed into each other by reallocating two items, and each agent is envy-free in one of the allocations. Since each agent receives exactly the same number s_h of items from each category h under A and A' , these allocations can be obtained from each other by swapping two items. Namely, there exist two items j, j' and two sets I_1, I_2 of items such that $A_1 = I_1 \cup \{j\}$, $A_2 = I_2 \cup \{j'\}$, $A'_1 = I_1 \cup \{j'\}$, and $A'_2 = I_2 \cup \{j\}$. By Pareto-optimality, at least one of the inequalities $u_1(I_1) \geq u_1(I_2)$ and $u_2(I_2) \geq u_2(I_1)$ holds. Without loss of generality, assume that the first inequality holds. Then, it follows that the allocation A or A' that makes agent 2 envy-free is both Pareto-optimal and EF[1,1] for the two agents.

We also extend the algorithm result of Shoshan, Segal-Halevi, and Hazan.

Theorem 2. *The allocation of Theorem 1 can be computed in polynomial time when n is a constant.*

1.3. Proof techniques. Before explaining our proof idea, let us first describe the approach by Shoshan et al. [13]. In the case of two agents, Shoshan et al. search for allocations that maximize $\sum_{i=1,2} t_i u_i(A_i)$ (weighted utilitarian optimal allocations) and update the weights along $t_1 \in (0, 1)$, with $t_1 + t_2 = 1$. If there are multiple optimal allocations, they break ties arbitrarily. Due to the classical characterization that fractional Pareto-optimal allocations are equivalent to weighted utilitarian optimal allocations with positive weights t_i [11, 15], the method generates a sequence of Pareto-optimal allocations, where each consecutive allocation is obtained by swapping two items. Along the way, there is a switching point at which the envy-relation reverses direction, and this point can be interpreted as the desired allocation.

In the above approach, moving from one Pareto-optimal allocation to the next one because of the change in the weights is reminiscent to the pivot step in the “shadow vertex” version of the simplex algorithm. This point of view was somehow the starting point of our method, even if this is maybe not transparent anymore in the final version. Yet, we kept the idea of relying to linear programming.

To generalize the result of Shoshan et al. to the case of n agents, we consider weighted utilitarian optimal allocations, where the weights lie now in the $(n-1)$ -dimensional standard simplex Δ^{n-1} . For weights on the boundary of the simplex, there exists an agent in the positive support who is envy-free at the corresponding optimal allocation. Then, applying the KKM (Knaster–Kuratowski–Mazurkiewicz) lemma [9], which is a set-covering variant of Brouwer’s fixed-point theorem and Sperner’s lemma, demonstrates the existence of a weight such that, for each agent i , there is an optimal allocation that makes agent i envy-free.

However, a direct application of the above approach does not necessarily yield Theorem 1. One difficulty is that weighted utilitarian optimal allocations, where the weights lie on the boundary of the simplex, are not necessarily Pareto-optimal. Another issue is that the optimal solutions may form a high-dimensional object (actually, a polytope), which could require reallocating many items to transition from one optimal allocation to another for the given weight. To address these issues, we slightly shrink the simplex to ensure that all weights are positive, while preserving the covering condition of the KKM lemma. Further, we perturb our objective function to reduce the dimension of each optimal face, establishing Theorem 1. The number of optimal faces we consider is bounded by a polynomial in the input size when n is a constant, yielding Theorem 2.

1.4. Related work. For two agents, Aziz et al. [1] designed an algorithm to find a Pareto-optimal and EF1 allocation of goods and chores, based on the classical Adjusted Winner algorithm [3]. An allocation A satisfies *envy-freeness up one item* (EF1) if for every pair of agents i, i' , there exists a set $S \subseteq A_i \cup A_{i'}$ of size at most 1 such that $u_i(A_i \setminus S) \geq u_i(A_{i'} \setminus S)$. Shoshan et al. [13] extended this result to a constrained setting, designing an algorithm to find a Pareto-optimal and EF[1, 1] allocation of goods and chores among two agents. Note that EF[1, 1] reduces to EF1 when all items are goods or when all items are chores. Dror et al. [7] considered the problem of finding an EF1 allocation under heterogeneous matroid constraints. Cookson et al. [6] showed that maximizing Nash welfare satisfies 1/2-EF1 and Pareto-optimality for non-negative utilities under any matroid constraints, where in this setting, an allocation A satisfies 1/2-EF1 if for every pair of agents i, i' , there exists a set $S \subseteq A_{i'}$ of size at most 1 such that $u_i(A_i) \geq \frac{1}{2}u_i(A_{i'} \setminus S)$. See Suksompong [14] for other types of constraints relevant to fair division.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Without loss of generality, we assume throughout this section and the next one that $|S_h| = ns_h$ for every $h \in [k]$. Indeed, we can create sufficiently many dummy items for which each agent has utility 0, as in Shoshan et al. [13].

Let $K := n \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m |u_i(j)| + 1$ and $\varepsilon_{ij} > 0$ for all $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$. For each point (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n) of the $(n-1)$ -dimensional standard simplex Δ^{n-1} , we consider the problem

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{P}(t)) \quad & \text{maximize} \quad \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 + (K-n)t_i\right) u_i(A_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i(A_i) \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad A \text{ is a feasible allocation,} \end{aligned}$$

where we use the notation $\varepsilon_i(S) = \sum_{j \in S} \varepsilon_{ij}$ for any subset S of $[m]$. Note that the $t'_i = \frac{1}{K}(1+(K-n)t_i)$ for $i \in [n]$ sum up to 1 and hence they belong to the standard simplex Δ^{n-1} .

We prove a series of lemmas that will eventually lead to a very short proof.

Lemma 3. *If $\varepsilon_{ij} < \frac{1}{Kn^2m}$ for all i, j , then every optimal solution A^* of $(\text{P}(t))$ is Pareto-optimal.*

Proof. Consider an optimal solution A^* , and assume for contradiction it is not Pareto-optimal. Let A' be some allocation that Pareto-dominates A^* . The value of the objective function for A' minus that for A^* is equal to

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 + (K-n)t_i\right) \left(u_i(A'_i) - u_i(A_i^*)\right) + \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\varepsilon_i(A'_i) - \varepsilon_i(A_i^*)\right).$$

Since the utilities are integers, this quantity is lower bounded by

$$\frac{1}{K} + \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\varepsilon_i(A'_i) - \varepsilon_i(A_i^*)\right) > 0,$$

contradicting the optimality of A^* . □

Lemma 4. *If $\varepsilon_{ij} < \frac{1}{Kn^2m}$ for all i, j , then every optimal solution A^* of $(\text{P}(t))$ is envy-free for some agent i^* with $t_{i^*} > 0$.*

Proof. Consider an arbitrary optimal solution A^* of $(P(t))$ and assume for a contradiction that no agent i with positive t_i is envy-free. Define the *envy-graph* of A^* whose vertices are the agents and where there is an arc from i to i' whenever agent i envies agent i' . Since A^* is Pareto-optimal (by Lemma 3), this graph does not admit a directed cycle. Pick i_1 with $t_{i_1} \geq 1/n$. Take a directed path from i_1 to some sink of the envy-graph and denote by i_1, i_2, \dots, i_q the vertices of this path. Note that by assumption t_{i_q} is 0. Define a new allocation A' as follows:

$$A'_i = \begin{cases} A_{i_{\ell+1}}^* & \text{if } i = i_\ell, \\ A_i^* & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $i_{q+1} = i_1$. The value of the objective function for A' minus that for A^* is equal to

$$(1) \quad \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 + (K-n)t_i\right) \left(u_i(A'_i) - u_i(A_i^*)\right) + \sum_{i=1}^n (\varepsilon_i(A'_i) - \varepsilon_i(A_i^*)).$$

The left-hand term can be expressed as

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q-1} \left(1 + (K-n)t_{i_\ell}\right) \left(u_{i_\ell}(A_{i_{\ell+1}}^*) - u_{i_\ell}(A_{i_\ell}^*)\right) + \frac{1}{K} \left(u_{i_q}(A_{i_1}^*) - u_{i_q}(A_{i_q}^*)\right).$$

Since the utilities are integers and agent i_ℓ envies agent $i_{\ell+1}$ when $\ell < q$, this left-hand term is lower-bounded by

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q-1} \left(1 + (K-n)t_{i_\ell}\right) - \frac{1}{K} \frac{K-1}{n} \geq \frac{1}{K} \left(1 + (K-n)\frac{1}{n}\right) - \frac{1}{K} \frac{K-1}{n} = \frac{1}{Kn}.$$

All in all, the difference (1) is larger than 0, contradicting the optimality of A^* . \square

To ease the discussion, we introduce the following bipartite graph $G = (V, E)$. The vertices on one side are all pairs (i, h) , where i is an agent and h a category. The vertices on the other side are the items. We put an edge between a pair (i, h) and an item j if j belongs to the category h . Consider the following linear program:

$$\begin{aligned} (\bar{P}(t)) \quad & \text{maximize} && \frac{1}{K} \sum_{e=(i,h)j \in E} \left(1 + (K-n)t_i\right) u_i(j)x_e + \sum_{e=(i,h)j \in E} \varepsilon_{ij}x_e \\ & \text{s.t.} && \sum_{e \in \delta(j)} x_e = 1 && \forall j \in [m] \\ & && \sum_{e \in \delta(i,h)} x_e = s_h && \forall i \in [n], h \in [k] \\ & && x_e \geq 0 && \forall e \in E. \end{aligned}$$

This linear program is the linear relaxation of $(P(t))$ where fractional allocations are allowed.

As explained in the introduction, keeping the dimension of the set of optimal solutions low is crucial, and Proposition 6 below ensures that this is possible by choosing arbitrarily small ε_{ij} . (The proof of Proposition 6 actually shows that the set of optimal solutions of this relaxation is generically a polytope of low dimension with respect to the ε_{ij} .) Its proof relies on the notion of feasible basis, reduced cost, and some elementary facts from linear programming, which we remind now. Consider a linear program in the standard form

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && c \cdot x \\ & \text{s.t.} && Mx = b \\ & && x \in \mathbb{R}_+^d, \end{aligned}$$

where M is assumed to be of full row rank. A *basis* B is a subset of columns of M such that the matrix M_B is non-singular. (We use the standard notation of linear programming where a matrix with a subset of columns as a subscript is the matrix restricted to those columns. Similarly, a vector with a subset of entries as a subscript is the vector restricted to those entries.) It is *feasible* if $M_B^{-1}b \geq 0$. By a straightforward computation, for any basis B and its complement N in the set of columns, the objective function of the program can be equivalently written as $c_B^\top M_B^{-1}b + (c_N^\top - c_B^\top M_B^{-1}M_N)x_N$ when

x is a feasible solution. The components of $c_N^\top - c_B^\top M_B^{-1} M_N$ are the *reduced costs* associated with B . It is well-known that if the program admits an optimal solution, then there exists a feasible basis B^* such that there is an optimal solution with support included in B^* and such that the associated reduced costs are all non-positive. What is also well-known is that the set of optimal solutions forms a face of the set of feasible solutions, which is a polyhedron. Complementary material about linear programming can be found in the many textbooks about linear programming, such as the one by Matoušek and Gärtner [10]. There is actually a relation between the dimension of the optimal face and the reduced costs, as shown by the following lemma. This is “common-knowledge” in linear programming, but we provide a complete proof since we are not aware of a proper reference.

Lemma 5. *The dimension of the optimal face is at most the number of 0’s among the reduced costs associated with B^* .*

Proof. Denote by q the dimension of the optimal face, and denote by y the optimal solution whose support is included in B^* . There exist q points z^1, z^2, \dots, z^q in the face such that the $z^i - y$ are linearly independent. Since M_{B^*} is non-singular, each of those z^i has at least one non-zero component in N^* (complement of B^*): otherwise, $z_{B^*}^i$ would be a solution of $M_{B^*} z_{B^*}^i = b$. Denote by H the subset of columns formed by B^* together with the supports of the z^i . The $z_H^i - y_H$ being linearly independent vectors in the kernel of M_H , the corank of this latter matrix is lower-bounded by q and the rank-nullity theorem implies $|H| \geq |B^*| + q$. By the optimality of the z^i , the reduced costs indexed by elements in $H \setminus B^*$ are equal to 0. Combining this with the previous inequality leads to the desired conclusion. \square

Proposition 6. *Let c^1, c^2, \dots, c^q be vectors in \mathbb{R}^d , and let M be an $r \times d$ real matrix and b be a vector of \mathbb{R}^r . Then we can choose arbitrarily small $\varepsilon_s > 0$ for $s \in [d]$ such that the dimension of the optimal face of the linear program*

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && c(t') \cdot x \\ & \text{s.t.} && Mx = b \\ & && x \in \mathbb{R}_+^d, \end{aligned}$$

is at most $q-1$ for every t' in the $(q-1)$ -dimensional standard simplex Δ^{q-1} , where $c_s(t') = \sum_{i=1}^q t'_i c_s^i + \varepsilon_s$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume M to be of full row rank and that $d \geq q + r$ (since otherwise the set of feasible solutions itself is of dimension at most $q-1$). For every pair (B, S) where B is a feasible basis and S a size- q subset of $[d] \setminus B$, we introduce the following $q \times q$ matrix

$$P(B, S) := C_S - C_B M_B^{-1} M_S,$$

where C is the $q \times d$ matrix whose i th row is the vector c^i . For each pair (B, S) for which $P(B, S)$ is non-singular, set $\lambda(B, S) := P(B, S)^{-1} \mathbf{1}$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is the all-one vector. For each pair (B, S) for which $P(B, S)$ is singular, choose a non-zero vector $\lambda(B, S)$ in \mathbb{R}^S such that $P(B, S)\lambda(B, S) = 0$.

Sample now each ε_s independently and uniformly at random on the open interval $(0, \alpha)$, for an arbitrary $\alpha > 0$. Remark the following two facts:

- (i) For the pairs (B, S) for which $P(B, S)$ is non-singular, the relation $\lambda(B, S)^\top (M_S^\top M_B^{-1\top} \varepsilon_B - \varepsilon_S) \neq 1$ holds almost surely.
- (ii) For the pairs (B, S) for which $P(B, S)$ is singular, the relation $\lambda(B, S)^\top (M_S^\top M_B^{-1\top} \varepsilon_B - \varepsilon_S) \neq 0$ holds almost surely.

Indeed, at least one component of $\lambda(B, S)$ is non-zero and the corresponding component of ε_S is drawn independently of the other components. So, from now on, we can assume that the ε_s have been chosen so that the relations of items (i) and (ii) are satisfied for all pairs (B, S) .

Let $t' \in \Delta^{q-1}$, and let B^* be an optimal basis of the linear program. It can be chosen so that each reduced cost with respect to B^* is non-positive. Suppose for a contradiction that the optimal face is of dimension at least q . According to Lemma 5, we can find q reduced costs equal to 0, i.e., a subset \overline{S} of q indices in $[d] \setminus B^*$ such that $c_{\overline{S}}(t')^\top = c_{B^*}(t')^\top M_{B^*}^{-1} M_{\overline{S}}$. By definition of $c(t')$, this equality writes

$$(2) \quad P(B^*, \overline{S})^\top t' = M_{\overline{S}}^\top M_{B^*}^{-1\top} \varepsilon_{B^*} - \varepsilon_{\overline{S}}.$$

Multiplying by $\lambda(B^*, \bar{S})^\top$ this equality, we get a contradiction with the relations of items (i) and (ii) and above. (We use $\sum_{i=1}^q t'_i = 1$ when $P(B^*, \bar{S})$ is non-singular.) \square

The proof of Proposition 6 is non-constructive since it relies on a probabilistic argument. It is actually not too difficult to make it constructive, as stated by Proposition 9 in Section 3.

In the proof of Theorem 1, Proposition 6 will be useful in combination with the following lemma.

Lemma 7. *For every $(n-1)$ -dimensional face of the set of feasible solutions of $(\bar{P}(t))$, the number of variables x_e that are fixed to 1 is at least $m - n(n-1)$.*

Proof. Denote by E_0 the set of edges e of G such that x_e is not constant on the face, and by r the number of vertices j not incident to E_0 .

For each connected component K of $G_0 = (V, E_0)$ with at least one edge, pick an arbitrary spanning tree T_K . Note that all vertices (i, h) in a connected component K have the same h . Pick an arbitrary point x in the relative interior of the face. We have $0 < x_e < 1$ for each edge $e \in E_0$. Any arbitrary small change of an x_e with $e \in E_0 \setminus (\bigcup_K E(T_K))$ can be corrected by changing the values of $x_{e'}$ with $e' \in E(T_K)$ for some connected component K . Indeed, T_K together with edge e admits a unique cycle e_1, e_2, \dots, e_ℓ starting with $e_1 = e$, which consists of an even number ℓ of edges since G is bipartite. If x_e decreases by δ , we can adjust x_{e_h} by increasing it by δ for even h and decreasing it by δ for odd h , ensuring that the new x remains within the same face. Thus, the dimension of the face is at least $|E_0| - \sum_K |E(T_K)|$. Since the face we consider is $(n-1)$ -dimensional, we get

$$(3) \quad n-1 \geq |E_0| - \sum_K |E(T_K)|.$$

From this inequality, we will derive two other inequalities involving the quantity κ defined as the number of connected components K of $G_0 = (V, E_0)$ with at least one edge. The edges in E_0 cover at most $m - r + \kappa n$ vertices, hence $\sum_K |E(T_K)| \leq m - r + \kappa(n-1)$, which combined with (3) leads to $m - r + (\kappa + 1)(n-1) \geq |E_0|$. This is the first inequality. The second one is $n-1 \geq \kappa$, obtained from (3) again, by noticing that the degree of every non-isolated vertex of G_0 is at least two (since x_e is fractional for every $e \in E_0$), and thus that no connected component K is a tree. Combining these two inequalities leads to $m - r + n(n-1) \geq |E_0|$.

On the other hand, $|E_0| \geq 2(m-r)$ because, as already noted, the degree of every non-isolated vertex in G_0 is at least two. Combining this last inequality with the previous one leads then to $r \geq m - n(n-1)$. Since each vertex j not incident to E_0 provides exactly one edge e such that x_e is fixed to 1 on the face, we get the desired conclusion. \square

The proof of Theorem 1 follows then from an application of the KKM (Knaster–Kuratowski–Mazurkiewicz) lemma [9].

Lemma 8 (KKM lemma). *Consider a collection C_1, C_2, \dots, C_{d+1} of closed subsets of the d -dimensional standard simplex Δ^d such that every $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{d+1})$ in Δ^d belongs to C_i for some i with $t_i > 0$. Then there exists a point of Δ^d belonging to all C_i simultaneously.*

Proof of Theorem 1. We define subsets C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n of Δ^{n-1} with the help of the optimal solutions of $(P(t))$, for which we set now the values of ε_{ij} . For this, we apply Proposition 6 with $c_e^i = u_i(j)$ for $e = (i, h)j$ where h is the category of j and M being the constraint matrix of $(\bar{P}(t))$, and b its right-hand side. This provides $\varepsilon_{ij} > 0$ for each $i \in [n]$ and each $j \in [m]$, which can be assumed to be smaller $\frac{1}{Kn^2m}$. (Recall that $(\bar{P}(t))$ is parametrized by such ε_{ij} 's.) A point (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n) belongs to C_i if there exists an optimal solution A^* of $(P(t))$, which is envy-free for agent i . We check now that these C_i satisfy the conditions of the KKM lemma with $d = n-1$. To see that C_i is closed, take a sequence of points $t^\ell = (t_1^\ell, t_2^\ell, \dots, t_n^\ell)_{\ell=1,2,\dots}$ in C_i that converges to some \bar{t} . For each ℓ , there exists an optimal solution A^ℓ of the problem $(P(t^\ell))$ such that A^ℓ is envy-free for agent i . Since there are finitely many allocations, up to taking a subsequence of the original sequence, we can assume that A^ℓ is the same allocation \bar{A} . This allocation \bar{A} is also optimal for $(P(\bar{t}))$ because the objective function is continuous in t . By the choice of the ε_{ij} 's, Lemma 4 implies that the sets C_i satisfies the covering condition.

By the KKM lemma (Lemma 8), there exists $t^* \in \Delta^{n-1}$ belonging to all C_i simultaneously. Denote by $A^{(1)}, A^{(2)}, \dots, A^{(n)}$ the optimal solutions of $(P(t^*))$ that are respectively envy-free for agents

$1, 2, \dots, n$. Set $t'_i := \frac{1}{K}(1 + (K - n)t_i^*)$ for all $i \in [n]$. Since $t' \in \Delta^{n-1}$, the choice of the ε_{ij} 's implies that the set of optimal solutions of $(\overline{P}(t'))$ is a face of dimension at most $n - 1$. The constraints of $(\overline{P}(t'))$ being totally unimodular, the allocations $A^{(1)}, A^{(2)}, \dots, A^{(n)}$ correspond to optimal solutions of this linear program. Lemma 7 implies then that $m - n(n - 1)$ items are allocated the same way in these allocations, and Lemma 3 shows that they are all Pareto-optimal. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

We start by proving a tractable version of Proposition 6 when its linear program has integer entries.

Proposition 9. *Consider the statement of Proposition 6. Suppose that the entries of the c^i , b , and M are integer. Given a rational number α of polynomial size, rational numbers ε_s smaller than α and satisfying the conclusion of the proposition can be computed in polynomial time.*

The proof of Proposition 9 uses the following easy lemma.

Lemma 10. *Let $P(X) = \sum_{j=0}^d a_j X^j$ be a non-zero polynomial of degree at most $d \geq 1$ in $\mathbb{R}[X]$, and let ρ, θ be positive numbers such that $\rho \leq |a_j| \leq \theta$ when $a_j \neq 0$. Then P has no root in $(-\frac{\rho}{d\theta}, \frac{\rho}{d\theta}) \setminus \{0\}$.*

Proof. Let x_0 be a root of P such that $x_0 \neq 0$. Denote by j^* the smallest index such that $a_{j^*} \neq 0$. The relation $x_0 \neq 0$ implies $j^* \neq d$. Since $P(x_0) = 0$, we have $|a_{j^*}| |x_0|^{j^*} \leq \sum_{j=j^*+1}^d |a_j| |x_0|^j$. If $|x_0| \geq 1$, then obviously $|x_0| \geq \frac{\rho}{d\theta}$. If $|x_0| < 1$, then $\rho |x_0|^{j^*} \leq (d - j^*)\theta |x_0|^{j^*+1}$, which implies in turn that $|x_0| \geq \frac{\rho}{d\theta}$ again since $x_0 \neq 0$. \square

Proof of Proposition 9. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\alpha < 1$. We keep the same notation as in the proof of Proposition 6. Remember in particular that B and S are disjoint subsets of $[d]$, with B of size r and S of size q . Moreover, we set $Q(B, S) := \det(M_B)P(B, S)$ and denote by $\|C\|_\infty$ and $\|M\|_\infty$ the maximum of the absolute values of the entries of respectively C and M . (In case $C = 0$ —which is anyway an obvious case—we implicitly define $\|C\|_\infty = 1$.) Notice that the matrix $Q(B, S)$ has integer entries, whose absolute values are upper bounded by $(r + 1)! \|C\|_\infty \|M\|_\infty^r$.

The goal is to build explicitly $\lambda(B, S)$ as in the proof of Proposition 6 and an $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ such that the following two properties hold:

- (a) $\|\varepsilon\|_\infty < \alpha$,
- (b) $\lambda(B, S)^\top (M_S^\top M_B^{-1\top} \varepsilon_B - \varepsilon_S)$ is not 1 when $P(B, S)$ is non-singular, and is not 0 when $P(B, S)$ is singular.

With such $\lambda(B, S)$ and ε , there cannot be any \overline{S} of size q satisfying (2), which translates into the fact that the optimal face has dimension at most $q - 1$.

For each pair (B, S) (as in the proof of Proposition 6) for which $P(B, S)$ is non-singular, set $\mu(B, S) := (\text{Cof}(Q(B, S)))^\top \mathbf{1}$, where the operator Cof applied to a matrix returns its cofactor. For each pair (B, S) for which $P(B, S)$ is singular, proceeds as follows: choose a non-singular square submatrix $Q'(B, S)$ of $Q(B, S)$ of maximal rank; denote respectively by $R \subset [q]$ and $S' \subset S$ the rows and columns chosen this way from $Q(B, S)$; let $f \in \mathbb{Z}^R$ be the vector obtained by summing the columns of $Q(B, S)$ in $S \setminus S'$, and by keeping only the entries in R ; set $\mu(B, S) \in \mathbb{R}^S$ to be the vector $-(\text{Cof}(Q'(B, S)))^\top f$ completed with entries equal to $\det(Q'(B, S))$. Notice that the absolute values of the entries of $\mu(B, S)$ are upper bounded by

$$q! ((r + 1)! \|C\|_\infty \|M\|_\infty^r)^{q-1} = q! ((r + 1)!)^{q-1} \|C\|_\infty^{q-1} \|M\|_\infty^{r(q-1)}.$$

When $P(B, S)$ is non-singular, set $\lambda(B, S) := \frac{\det(M_B)}{\det(Q(B, S))} \mu(B, S)$. In this case, we have $\lambda(B, S) = P(B, S)^{-1} \mathbf{1}$ and

$$\lambda(B, S)^\top (M_S^\top M_B^{-1\top} \varepsilon_B - \varepsilon_S) \neq 1 \iff \det(M_B) \mu(B, S)^\top (M_S^\top M_B^{-1\top} \varepsilon_B - \varepsilon_S) \neq \det(Q(B, S)).$$

When $P(B, S)$ is singular, set $\lambda(B, S) := \det(M_B) \mu(B, S)$. In this case, we have $\lambda(B, S)$ non-zero and

$$\lambda(B, S)^\top (M_S^\top M_B^{-1\top} \varepsilon_B - \varepsilon_S) \neq 0 \iff \det(M_B) \mu(B, S)^\top (M_S^\top M_B^{-1\top} \varepsilon_B - \varepsilon_S) \neq 0.$$

Let us check that in this case we have in addition $P(B, S) \lambda(B, S) = 0$. The entries in R of $Q(B, S) \mu(B, S)$ are by construction equal to $-Q'(B, S) (\text{Cof}(Q'(B, S)))^\top f + \det(Q'(B, S)) f = 0$.

Since the rank of the rows of $Q(B, S)$ in R is the rank of $Q(B, S)$, every row not in R is a linear combination of rows in R . This implies $Q(B, S)\mu(B, S) = 0$, and hence $P(B, S)\lambda(B, S) = 0$.

Write $\det(M_B)\mu(B, S)^\top (M_S^\top M_B^{-1\top} \varepsilon_B - \varepsilon_S)$ as $\sum_{s \in B \cup S} a_s \varepsilon_s$. The a_s are integers and we have $\|a\|_\infty \leq \theta'$, where we have chosen (not tight)

$$\theta' := (q+1)! ((r+1)!)^q \|C\|_\infty^q \|M\|_\infty^{rq}.$$

According to Lemma 10 with $\rho = 1$, and $\theta = \max(2, \theta')$, setting $\varepsilon_s = (\frac{\alpha}{d\theta})^s$ ensures that ε satisfies the properties (a) and (b). (When $P(B, S)$ is non-singular, we use Lemma 10 with $a_0 := -\det(Q(B, S))$.) The number θ' is computable in polynomial time and so are the ε_s 's. \square

Now we return to the graph G and the linear programming $(\bar{P}(t))$ defined in Section 2. For every elementary cycle C of G , we introduce a hyperplane H_C of \mathbb{R}^E , defined as follows. Write C as its sequence e_1, e_2, \dots, e_ℓ of edges, with arbitrary first edge. Note that ℓ is even as G bipartite. Then $H_C := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^E : y_{e_1} - y_{e_2} + y_{e_3} - y_{e_4} + \dots - y_{e_\ell} = 0\}$. We consider the arrangement formed by these hyperplanes H_C when C ranges over the set of all elementary cycles of G .

Lemma 11. *Consider $(\bar{P}(t))$, but with a general objective function of the form $\sum_{e \in E} c_e x_e$, for any $c \in \mathbb{R}^E$. Given two costs c^1, c^2 , if the supporting cell of c^1 contains that of c^2 , then all optimal solutions for c^1 are optimal for c^2 .*

Proof. We rely on the approach described by Schrijver for transportation problems [12, Chapter 21]. Given a cost c and a feasible solution x , we introduce a directed graph $D_x = (V, A)$ with arc costs, where V is still the vertex set of G , but where A is built as follows. For each edge $e = (i, h)j$ of G , there is an arc $((i, h), j)$ with cost $-c_e$ if $x_e > 0$, and an arc $(j, (i, h))$ with cost c_e if $x_e < 1$. The following characterization holds: *x is optimal if and only if there is no directed cycle of total positive cost.* (This is Theorem 21.12 in the aforementioned book. Note that in the book it is a minimization problem.) Note that we can ignore directed cycles of length two in that characterization since there are all always of zero cost.

Assume that the supporting cell of c^1 contains that of c^2 . Consider any optimal solution x^* for c^1 . Let us show that x^* is also optimal for c^2 . Consider a directed cycle \vec{C} in D_{x^*} of length at least four. By optimality, its cost with respect to c^1 is non-positive. The total cost of the directed cycle writes then as $c_{e_1}^1 - c_{e_2}^1 + \dots - c_{e_\ell}^1$, which means that c^1 is located on the non-positive side of H_C , where we keep the notation C for the undirected underlying cycle. Since c^2 is located on the same side as c^1 , we have $c_{e_1}^2 - c_{e_2}^2 + \dots - c_{e_\ell}^2 \leq 0$, which means that the total cost of \vec{C} with respect to c^2 is non-positive as well. \square

The proof of Theorem 2 relies on the following elementary facts from linear algebra, which we state and prove for sake of completeness.

Lemma 12. *The intersection of two affine subspaces of \mathbb{R}^d respectively of dimension d_1 and d_2 is either empty, or of dimension at least $d_1 + d_2 - d$.*

Proof. Consider two affine subspaces of \mathbb{R}^d , with a non-empty intersection. Pick a point x in the intersection. The two subspaces can then be written under the form $x + F_1$ and $x + F_2$, where F_1 and F_2 are two linear subspaces of \mathbb{R}^d , with $\dim(F_1) = d_1$ and $\dim(F_2) = d_2$. The intersection of the affine subspaces can then be written as $x + F_1 \cap F_2$. By basic linear algebra, we have $\dim(F_1 \cap F_2) = \dim(F_1) + \dim(F_2) - \dim(F_1 + F_2)$. The dimension of $F_1 + F_2$ being upper-bounded by d , we get that the dimension of $F_1 \cap F_2$ is lower bounded by $d_1 + d_2 - d$, which implies the desired conclusion. \square

Lemma 13. *Consider an affine subspace F determined by the intersection of some hyperplanes in \mathbb{R}^d . Then F is already determined by exactly $d - \dim(F)$ of them.*

Proof. Let H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r be hyperplanes such that $F = \bigcap_{\ell=1}^r H_\ell$. We prove now by descending induction on $\dim(F) = d'$ that there is a subset $S \subseteq [r]$ of cardinality $d - d'$ such that $F = \bigcap_{\ell \in S} H_\ell$.

Suppose first that $\dim(F) = d - 1$. In this case, F is a hyperplane. It must be contained in every H_ℓ and for dimensional reason coincides actually with every H_ℓ . Any H_ℓ already determines F . Suppose now that the result is true for some $d' \leq d - 1$. Assume that $\dim(F) = d' - 1$. Let $r' \leq r$ be the minimal integer such that $F = \bigcap_{\ell=1}^{r'} H_\ell$. By Lemma 12 with $F_1 = \bigcap_{\ell=1}^{r'-1} H_\ell$ and $F_2 = H_{r'}$, the

dimension of $\bigcap_{\ell=1}^{r'-1} H_\ell$ is at most d' . By the minimality of r' , it is at least d' , and so it is exactly d' . By induction, there is a subset $T \subseteq [r' - 1]$ of cardinality $d - d'$ that $H_1 \cap \dots \cap H_{r'-1} = \bigcap_{\ell \in T} H_\ell$. Setting $S = T \cup \{r'\}$ allows to conclude the claim. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. For each $i \in [n - 1]$ and $e \in E$, let $c_e^i = u_i(j)$ if e corresponds to an edge $(i, h)j$. Up to multiplying the $u_i(j)$ by some integer, we can assume that the c_e^i are integers, and we can thus define some ε according to Proposition 9, with M being the constraint matrix of $(\overline{\mathbf{P}}(t))$, b its right-hand side, and $\alpha = \frac{1}{Kn^2m}$.

Let Q be the set of vectors $(c_e(t))_{e \in E}$ with $c_e(t) = \frac{1}{K}(1 + (K - n)t_i)c_e^i + \varepsilon_e$ (still with $e = (i, h)j$) and t in the $(n - 1)$ -dimensional standard simplex Δ^{n-1} . Note that these vectors are exactly the cost vectors of $(\overline{\mathbf{P}}(t))$. The hyperplanes H_C determine an arrangement within the polytope Q : the intersection of any H_C with Q is of dimension $\dim(Q)$ or $\dim(Q) - 1$ (by Lemma 12); keep only those for which the intersection is of dimension $\dim(Q) - 1$; these intersections are then hyperplanes of the affine hull of Q .

Consider now a vertex $(c_e(t))_{e \in E}$ of this arrangement. Remark defining $t'_i := \frac{1}{K}(1 + (K - n)t_i)$ makes that t' belongs to the $(n - 1)$ -dimensional simplex Δ^{n-1} . Proposition 9 and Lemma 7 together show that for the corresponding optimal face, there are at least $m - n(n - 1)$ items j for which the value of x_e , with e incident to j , is fixed to 1. We determine these edges by fixing, for each edge e independently, x_e respectively to 0 and 1, and see whether the optimal value remains the same by solving the corresponding linear program (which can be done in polynomial time). If the optimal value remains the same, then x_e is not fixed on the optimal face. Otherwise, it is fixed. For each vertex of the arrangement, there are thus at most $n(n - 1)$ items that are not allocated in a unique way and we try all possible allocations of these items by brute-force. According to Lemma 11, we do not lose any optimal solution, and in particular, we will consider the optimal solutions $A^{(1)}, A^{(2)}, \dots, A^{(n)}$ of $(\mathbf{P}(t^*))$ in the proof of Theorem 1, which are Pareto-optimal and envy-free respectively for agents $1, 2, \dots, n$. For each vertex of the arrangement, this makes $O(n^{n(n-1)})$ possible integral optimal allocations to check.

By Lemma 13, each vertex is determined by at most $n - 1$ hyperplanes of the affine hull of Q . (Note that such a vertex can be located on a face of Q , but then Lemma 13 shows that less than $n - 1$ hyperplanes determine the vertex.) Each vertex is thus determined by at most $n - 1$ hyperplanes H_C . Since there are $O(m^{2n})$ cycles C , this makes $O(m^{2n(n-1)})$ vertices, and we get the desired complexity. \square

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Theorem 1 guarantees envy-freeness for each agent after reallocating at most $n(n - 1)$ items. An open question is whether this bound can be improved, allowing for envy-freeness with fewer reallocations. Additionally, in Theorem 2, we assume that the number n of agents is a constant. It would be interesting to explore whether a more efficient algorithm exists in terms of computational complexity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partially supported by JST FOREST Grant Numbers JPMJPR20C1.

REFERENCES

- [1] Haris Aziz, Ioannis Caragiannis, Ayumi Igarashi, and Toby Walsh. Fair allocation of indivisible goods and chores. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 36(1):3:1–3:21, 2022.
- [2] Siddharth Barman, Sanath Kumar Krishnamurthy, and Rohit Vaish. Finding fair and efficient allocations. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, pages 557–574, 2018.
- [3] Steven J. Brams and Alan D. Taylor. *Fair Division: From Cake-Cutting to Dispute Resolution*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [4] Eric Budish. The combinatorial assignment problem: Approximate competitive equilibrium from equal incomes. *Journal of Political Economy*, 119(6):1061–1103, 2011.
- [5] Ioannis Caragiannis, David Kurokawa, Hervé Moulin, Ariel D. Procaccia, Nisarg Shah, and Junxing Wang. The unreasonable fairness of maximum Nash welfare. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation*, 7(3):12:1–12:32, 2019.

- [6] Benjamin Cookson, Soroush Ebadian, and Nisarg Shah. Constrained fair and efficient allocations. In *Proceedings of the 39th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, volume 39, 2025. Extended version available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.00133>.
- [7] Amitay Dror, Michal Feldman, and Erel Segal-Halevi. On fair division under heterogeneous matroid constraints. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 76:567–611, 2023.
- [8] Edmund Eisenberg and David Gale. Consensus of subjective probabilities: The pari-mutuel method. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 30(1):165–168, 1959.
- [9] Bronisław Knaster, Kazimierz Kuratowski, and Stefan Mazurkiewicz. Ein Beweis des Fixpunktsatzes für n -dimensionale Simplexe. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 14(1):132–137, 1929.
- [10] Jiří Matoušek and Bernd Gärtner. *Understanding and using linear programming*, volume 1. Springer, 2007.
- [11] Takashi Negishi. Welfare economics and existence of an equilibrium for a competitive economy. *Metroeconomica*, 12(2-3):92–97, 1960.
- [12] Alexander Schrijver. *Combinatorial optimization: polyhedra and efficiency*, volume A. Springer.
- [13] Hila Shoshan, Noam Hazon, and Erel Segal-Halevi. Efficient nearly-fair division with capacity constraints. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS)*, pages 206–214, 2023.
- [14] Warut Suksompong. Constraints in fair division. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges*, 19(2):46–61, 2021.
- [15] Hal R. Varian. Two problems in the theory of fairness. *Journal of Public Economics*, 5(3):249–260, 1976.

UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO, TOKYO, JAPAN
Email address: `igarashi@mist.i.u-tokyo.ac.jp`

ÉCOLE NATIONALE DES PONTS ET CHAUSSÉES, FRANCE
Email address: `frederic.meunier@enpc.fr`