

Random Assignment Under Bi-Valued Utilities: Analyzing Hylland-Zeckhauser, Nash-Bargaining, and other Rules

Haris Aziz^{1,2} and Ethan Brown¹

¹ UNSW Sydney, Australia
{haris.aziz,e.brown}@unsw.edu.au
² Data61 CSIRO

Abstract. The Hylland-Zeckhauser (HZ) rule is a well-known rule for random assignment of items. The complexity of the rule has received renewed interest recently with Vazirani and Yannakakis (2020) proposing a strongly polynomial-time algorithm for the rule under bi-valued utilities, and making several general insights. We study the rule under the case of agents having bi-valued utilities. We point out several characterizations of the HZ rule, drawing clearer relations with several well-known rules in the literature. As a consequence, we point out alternative strongly polynomial-time algorithms for the HZ solution. We also give reductions from computing the HZ solution to computing well-known solutions based on leximin or Nash social welfare. An interesting contrast is that the HZ rule is group-strategyproof whereas the unconstrained competitive equilibrium with equal incomes rule is not even strategyproof. We clarify which results change when moving from 1-0 utilities to the more general bi-valued utilities. Finally, we prove that the closely related Nash bargaining solution violates envy-freeness and strategyproofness even under 1-0 utilities.

1 Introduction

Competitive Equilibrium with Equal Incomes (CEEI) is one of the most fundamental solution concepts in resource allocation (Budish, 2011, Moulin, 2003, Varian, 1974). The concept is based on the idea of a market-based equilibrium which underpins classical economics and has been referred to as the crown jewel of mathematical economics. In CEEI, each agent is considered to have equal budget of unit one to spend. An assignment of items satisfies CEEI if, for some price vector for the items, the supply meets demand. In other words, the agents get allocations that give them the maximum possible utility. CEEI is a well-established in economics because it is based on the idea of a market equilibrium. It is an attractive solution concept because it implies envy-freeness and Pareto optimality.

We consider the problem of allocating n items among n agents. Agents have additive cardinal utilities over the items. If we view the items as divisible and

do not impose any limits on the amount of items given to agents, then CEEI is well-understood. Under additive utilities, CEEI is equivalent to maximizing Nash social welfare. The equivalence follows from an analysis of the Eisenberg-Gale convex program that maximizes the Nash welfare within the assignments of divisible items. However, such a characterization disappears when each agent has a demand for exactly one unit of items. The constraint of unit capacities is especially critical when the fractions of items given to agents are interpreted as probabilities and the goal is to probabilistically find an assignment in which each agent gets one item. If each agent gets one unit of items, then the given probabilistic assignment can be instantiated into a lottery over perfect matchings using Birkhoff’s theorem.

In this paper, we focus on the pseudo-market rule proposed by [Hylland and Zeckhauser \(1979\)](#) that is inspired by CEEI. We will refer to the rule as the HZ rule. HZ can be viewed as the suitable CEEI solution for *probabilistic* or *random* assignment of *indivisible* items.³ The HZ rule has been referred to as CEEI in the literature. We will not use the term CEEI for HZ so that it is clear that we assume the unit-demand requirement when referring to the HZ solution. The complexity of computing the HZ solution has been open for 40 years ([Vazirani and Yannakakis, 2020](#), [Sethuraman, 2010](#)). Recently, [Vazirani and Yannakakis \(2020\)](#) explored the computational complexity of the HZ rule. They make several general insights including the fact that the HZ solution can be irrational. They present a strongly polynomial-time algorithm to compute the HZ solution under bi-valued utilities. We also focus on the random assignment problem under (cardinal) bi-valued utilities. Bi-valued utilities are meaningful in any scenario in which agents partition items among better and worse and we give them flexibility to express the intensity of preferences. Cognitively, an agent may have a threshold and may prefer items that reach that threshold level. This threshold level may indicate usability or acceptable quality level. Bi-valued are also more general than binary (1-0) utilities that are studied in resource allocation ([Barman et al., 2018](#), [Halpern et al., 2020](#)), random assignment ([Bogomolnaia and Moulin, 2004](#)), approval voting ([Brams and Fishburn, 2007](#)), probabilistic voting ([Bogomolnaia et al., 2005](#)) and committee voting ([Aziz et al., 2017](#)).

Contributions We consider random assignment problem under (cardinal) bi-valued utilities. We prove several characterizations of the HZ rule, drawing clearer relations with several well-known rules in the literature. As a consequence, we point out alternative strongly polynomial-time algorithms for the HZ solution. In particular, we show that the Extended Probabilistic Serial (EPS) by [Katta and Sethuraman \(2006\)](#) (which is designed for egalitarian objectives) also returns the HZ solution. For bi-valued utilities, we also provide a reduction from computing the HZ rule to computing the leximin or maximum Nash welfare solution. Another structural insight we have is the following one: for all HZ solu-

³ There are several works on probabilistic assignment of items to agents ([Bogomolnaia and Moulin, 2001](#), [Aziz et al., 2013, 2014](#), [Kavitha et al., 2011](#), [Filos-Ratsikas et al., 2014](#), [Katta and Sethuraman, 2006](#)).

tions under bi-valued utilities, each item gets the same price in all the solutions as long as the underlying dichotomous preferences do not change. We also show the following interesting contrast. Under bi-valued utilities, the HZ rule is group-strategyproof whereas the (unconstrained) CEEI rule is not even strategyproof. Therefore, an innocuous-looking relaxation of the unit-demand requirement leads to completely different strategic properties. Our result regarding the manipulability of the CEEI rule also implies that for bi-valued utilities, the MNW rule of Caragiannis et al. (2016) for indivisible goods is not strategyproof. Finally, we study the Nash Bargaining rule that has close links with MNW, CEEI, and HZ rules. We prove that the Nash bargaining solution violates envy-freeness and strategyproofness even under 1-0 utilities.

2 Preliminaries

An assignment problem is a triple (N, O, u) such that $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$ is the set of agents, $O = \{o_1, \dots, o_n\}$ is the set of items, and $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$ is the utility profile which specifies for each agent $i \in N$ utility function u_i where u_{ij} denotes the utility of agent i for item o_j . We assume that for each $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $u_{ij} > 0$ for some $i \in N$ and for each $i \in N$, $u_{ij} > 0$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

A fractional assignment x is a $(n \times n)$ matrix $[x_{ij}]$ such that $x_{ij} \in [0, 1]$ for all $i \in N$, and $o_j \in O$, and $\sum_{i \in N} x_{ij} = 1$ for all $o_j \in O$. The value x_{ij} represents the fraction of item o_j being allocated to agent i . In a probabilistic context, the value x_{ij} has a natural interpretation as the probability of i getting item o_j . Each row $x_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{in})$ represents the *allocation* of agent i . We will denote the set of all allocations by \mathcal{A} . An allocation x_i is balanced if $\sum_{o_j \in O} x_{ij} = 1$. We will denote the set of all balanced allocations by \mathcal{A}_b . For any allocation x_i , we will refer to $\sum_{o_j \in O} x_{ij}$ as the *size* of the allocation. The set of columns correspond to the items o_1, \dots, o_n . A fractional assignment is *discrete* if $x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $i \in N$ and $o_j \in O$. Let the set of all fractional assignments be \mathcal{F} . A fractional assignment is *balanced* if $\sum_{o_j \in O} x_{ij} = 1$ for all $i \in N$. Let the set of all balanced fractional assignments be \mathcal{F}_b .

The expected utility received by agent i from assignment x is $u_i(x_i) = \sum_{o_j \in O} x_{ij} u_{ij}$.

We say that the utility functions are binary or 1-0 if $u_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $i, j \in N$. We say that the utility functions are bi-valued if for all i , $u_{ij} \in \{\alpha_i, \beta_i\}$ where $\alpha_i > \beta_i \geq 0$. Both binary and bi-valued preferences are forms of dichotomous preferences. We will denote by D_i the set of items most preferred by agent i . For any bi-valued utility function involving values α_i, β_i , we call by *binary-reduced* those utility functions in which α_i is turned into 1 and β_i is turned into zero.

An assignment x is *Pareto optimal (PO)* if there exists no other assignment y such that $u_i(y_i) \geq u_i(x_i)$ for all $i \in N$ and $u_i(y_i) > u_i(x_i)$ for some $i \in N$. An assignment x is *Pareto optimal among balanced assignments* if there exists no balanced assignment y such that $u_i(y_i) \geq u_i(x_i)$ for all $i \in N$ and $u_i(y_i) > u_i(x_i)$ for some $i \in N$.

We present a simple routine to turn an unbalanced assignment into a balanced one. We will refer to it as the balancing operation.

Balancing operation If an assignment is not balanced, we consider sets $N^+ = \{i \in N : \sum_{o_j \in O} x_{ij} > 1\}$ and $N^- = \{i \in N : \sum_{o_j \in O} x_{ij} < 1\}$. Each agent $i \in N^+$ gives away the least preferred items from her allocation so as to ensure that her allocation x_i has size 1. The donated items are then given to N^- arbitrarily to ensure that $\sum_{o_j \in O} x_{ij} = 1$ for all $i \in N$.

3 Solution Concepts

We present a few prominent solution concepts starting with the HZ solution.

An assignment x is an *HZ solution* if $x \in \mathcal{F}_b$ and there exists a price vector $p = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ that specifies the price p_j of item o_j such that the maximal share that each $i \in N$ can get with budget 1 is

$$x_i \in \{x'_i \in \mathcal{A}_b : x'_i \in \operatorname{argmax}\{u_i(x'_i) : \sum_{o_j \in O} x'_{ij} \cdot (p_j) \leq 1\}\}$$

and

$$\sum_{o_j \in O} p_j x_{ij} = \min\left\{\sum_{o_j \in O} p_j y_{ij} \mid y_i \in \mathcal{A}_b, \sum_{o_j \in O} u_{ij} y_{ij} \geq \sum_{o_j \in O} u_{ij} x_{ij}\right\}.$$

We will refer to the rule that returns the HZ solution as the *HZ rule*.

A closely related concept is CEEI. An assignment x satisfies *competitive equilibrium with equal incomes (CEEI)* if there exists a price vector $p = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ that specifies the price p_j of item o_j such that the maximal share that each $i \in N$ can get with budget 1 is

$$x_i \in \{x'_i \in \mathcal{A} : x'_i \in \operatorname{argmax}\{u_i(x'_i) : \sum_{o_j \in O} x'_{ij} \cdot (p_j) \leq 1\}\}$$

and

$$\sum_{o_j \in O} p_j x_{ij} = \min\left\{\sum_{o_j \in O} p_j y_{ij} \mid y \in \mathcal{A}, \sum_{o_j \in O} u_{ij} y_{ij} \geq \sum_{o_j \in O} u_{ij} x_{ij}\right\}.$$

The CEEI rule returns a CEEI assignment. CEEI (Varian, 1974) coincides with the market equilibrium notion studied in (Vazirani, 2007). Note that the HZ solution can be viewed as CEEI with the additional constraint that each agent gets one unit of items. For both CEEI and HZ, we require that if an agent can get multiple maximal shares under given prices, she gets a cheapest possible maximal share.

The MNW (Maximum Nash Welfare) rule returns an assignment x that maximizes the Nash social welfare:

$$x \in \operatorname{argmax}_{x' \in \mathcal{F}} \prod_{i \in N} u_i(x'_i).$$

For two vectors $\vec{u}, \vec{v} \in \mathbb{R}^k$, we say that \vec{u} leximin-dominates \vec{v} , written $\vec{u} \succ_{lex} \vec{v}$, if there exists an $i \leq k$ such that $\vec{u}_j = \vec{v}_j$, for all $j < i$, and $\vec{u}_i > \vec{v}_i$. Finally, π is leximin optimal if there is no π' such that $\vec{u}(\pi') \succ_{lex} \vec{u}(\pi)$. The *leximin rule* is the rule that returns a leximin optimal assignment.

CEEI, MNW, and leximin may not return a balanced assignment.

We will say that two rules are *equivalent* if they result in the same utilities for the agents.

Example 1. Consider the following instance with two agents and items.

| | o_1 | o_2 |
|---|-------|-------|
| 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 0 |

For this instance, the HZ, MNW constrained to balanced assignments, and the MNW solution are as follows.

$$\text{HZ solution} = \begin{matrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} o_1 & o_2 \\ \left(\begin{matrix} 1/2 & 1/2 \\ 1/2 & 1/2 \end{matrix} \right) \end{matrix}$$

$$\text{MNW solution constrained to balanced assignments} = \begin{matrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} o_1 & o_2 \\ \left(\begin{matrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{matrix} \right) \end{matrix}$$

$$\text{CEEI} = \text{MNW solution} = \begin{matrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} o_1 & o_2 \\ \left(\begin{matrix} 1/6 & 1 \\ 5/6 & 0 \end{matrix} \right) \end{matrix}$$

For CEEI, the price of o_1 is $6/5$ and o_2 is $4/5$.

$$\text{Leximin solution} = \text{Balanced Leximin} = \begin{matrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} o_1 & o_2 \\ \left(\begin{matrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{matrix} \right) \end{matrix}$$

Note that if all the outcomes are balanced (as is the case under the HZ rule) and an agent's preferences are dichotomous, then an agent's preferences over the allocations only depends on the stochastic dominance relation over outcomes.

4 Bi-valued Utilities: Relations of HZ with other Rules and Algorithms

Binary (1-0) utilities are a special class of utilities under which many rules and algorithms coincide.

Fact 1. *Under 1-0 utilities, the following rules are equivalent even if the number of items is different than the number of agents:*

1. *Leximin rule*

2. *Maximum Nash Welfare (MNW) rule*
3. *Competitive Equilibrium with Equal Incomes (CEEI) (Varian, 1974)*
4. *Controlled Cake Eating Algorithm (CCEA)⁴ (Aziz and Ye, 2014)*
5. *Mechanism 1 of Chen et al. (2010).*

For example, CEEI and MNW are well-known to be equivalent even for general additive utilities (Vazirani, 2007). Under 1-0 utilities, all the rules were shown to be equivalent (Aziz and Ye, 2014). Since the leximin rule gives rise to a unique utility profile (agents' utilities do not change under different leximin outcomes), it follows that all the rules above give rise to a unique utility profile. The rules above may not return a balanced assignment even for 1-0 utilities. Therefore, they are most suitable when the items are viewed as divisible.

Next we highlight the intimate connection between the HZ rule under bi-valued utilities and the elegant Extended Probabilistic Serial (EPS) algorithm of Katta and Sethuraman (2006). EPS is well-defined for any weak orders but we will stick to its presentation for the case of dichotomous preferences. The running time is $O(n^3 \log n)$ under dichotomous preferences. Katta and Sethuraman (2006) note that EPS for dichotomous preferences is equivalent to the egalitarian rule studied by Bogomolnaia and Moulin (2004). The egalitarian rule studied by Bogomolnaia and Moulin (2004) is the leximin rule applied to the set of balanced (unit-demand) assignments. Bogomolnaia and Moulin (2004) studied the rule in the context of two-sided matching with men on one side and women on the other side. We adapt the presentation of Katta and Sethuraman (2006) which is more algorithmic in nature and is directly focussed on the assignment problem with one-sided preferences.

Extended Probabilistic Serial (EPS) for dichotomous preferences For each agent i , let D_i denote the set of items most preferred by i . Agents gradually guarantee more and more fractional amount of liked items until agents cannot guarantee more. At this point there is a bottleneck set of agents who cannot fractionally get more amount of liked items. Let $v = \min_{C \subseteq N} \frac{|\cup_{i \in C} D_i|}{|C|}$ and X_1 denote the largest cardinality set $X_1 \subseteq N$ for which $\frac{|\cup_{i \in X_1} D_i|}{|X_1|} = v$. Such a bottleneck set can be computed via network flows as explained by Katta and Sethuraman (2006). When we are allowed fractional allocations, then agents in X_1 can each get utility v . These agents X_1 and the items that they like O_1 are removed from the market. The same process is recursively applied to the remaining market until all items are allocated. Once all agents exit from the market, then the remaining items are allocated among those agents who got less than one unit of items to ensure that the allocation is balanced. Note that each successive bottleneck set has a strictly higher utility guarantee v : $v_1 < v_2 < \dots < v_k$. The algorithm is specified as Algorithm 1.

⁴ The Controlled Cake Eating Algorithm (CCEA) algorithm (Aziz and Ye, 2014) and Mechanism 1 of Chen et al. (2010) are described in the context of cake cutting. They also apply to allocation of items: each cake segment can be treated as a separate item.

Input: (N, O, u) under 1-0 utilities
Output: A balanced assignment

- 1: $N' \leftarrow N; O' \leftarrow O$
- 2: $k \leftarrow 1$
- 3: **while** $N' \neq \emptyset$ **do**
- 4: **if** each agent $i \in N'$ can get one unit of items in $D_i \cap O'$ **then**
- 5: Give each agent $i \in N'$ one unit of items from $D_i \cap O'$ [can be done via an algorithm to compute a maximum size matching]
- 6: **else**
- 7: Let

$$v_k = \min_{C \subseteq N'} \frac{|\cup_{i \in C} (D_i \cap O')|}{|C|}$$
 and X_k denote the largest cardinality set $X_k \subseteq N'$ for which $\frac{|\cup_{i \in X_k} (D_i \cap O')|}{|X_k|} = v_k$. Such a bottleneck set can be computed via network flows (Katta and Sethuraman, 2006). Let $\cup_{i \in X_k} (D_i \cap O')$ be O_k .
- 8: Agents in X_k can each get utility v_k by getting items from O_k . Assignment x for agents in X_k is finalized. These agents X_k and the items that they like O_k are removed from the market: $N' \leftarrow N' \setminus X_k; O' \leftarrow O' \setminus O_k$;
- 9: $k \leftarrow k + 1$
- 10: For agents in $\{i \in N : \sum_{o_j \in O} x_{ij} < 1\}$, give them any remaining unallocated items in $O^0 \subset O'$ to ensure that the assignment x is balanced.
- 11: **return** x .

Algorithm 1: EPS rule for dichotomous preferences

Next, we present a theorem which clarifies the relations between many rules.

Theorem 1. *For 1-0 utilities, the following rules are equivalent.*

1. HZ rule
2. EPS rule
3. Egalitarian rule of *Bogomolnaia and Moulin (2004)*
4. Leximin applied to the set of balanced assignments
5. MNW applied to the set of balanced assignments
6. The rule that applies the balancing operation to a leximin solution
7. The rule that applies the balancing operation to a MNW solution
8. The rule that applies the balancing operation to a CEEI solution.

Proof.

2 \implies 1:

Let the EPS outcome be x . We compute the prices p of the items such that $x_i \in \{x'_i \in \mathcal{A}_b : x'_i \in \operatorname{argmax}\{u_i(x'_i) : \sum_{o_j \in O} x'_{ij} \cdot (p_j) \leq 1\}\}$. Consider the run of EPS on dichotomous preferences. When a set of agents $X_k \subseteq N$ in

EPS becomes a bottleneck set and each agent gets utility v , we can set the individual prices of the goods allocated to agents in X_k to $p_j = 1/v_k$ for all o_j allocated to the agents in X_k . Each agent in X_k at this point gets an allocation that does not exceed size constraints. Moreover, it gets total utility v_k for items each of which cost $1/v_k$. An agent $i \in X_k$ does not like any items after items O_k are removed from O' . It may most prefer items that were removed before O_k were removed. However, those items have even higher prices because the v value progressively becomes more with the next bottleneck set and hence the prices keep going lower. Therefore for each agent in X_k , the utility v_k is the maximum utility that can be achieved if $i \in N$ was to buy liked items at their prices according to p . For any extraneous items that are allocated in Step 10, they can get price 0. We have proved that 2 implies 1.

1 \implies 8

Consider an HZ solution. Note that no agent pays anything for a zero utility item because if it did, it can get a bit more of a one utility item. Therefore, if an agent gets a zero utility item, its price is zero. We show that there is a CEEI solution under the same prices. Consider all the agents who get utility less than 1 in an HZ solution. For such agents, the size constraint does not impact in specifying their demand set (best possible feasible allocations within the budget). Now consider the agents who get utility 1 in the HZ solution. Their demand set changes when the size constraints are removed because they can avail an additional amount of items. In the HZ solution, all such additional items are given to agents with utility less than one to ensure that every agent has total amount one. Hence, these additional items have zero price. We claim that there is a CEEI outcome under the same prices. Each agent who gets utility less than one in the HZ outcome clearly maximizes her utility even if the size constraints are removed. The only agents who can get more utility under the CEEI outcomes are the ones who got utility one in the HZ solution but can benefit from zero price items. Therefore the market clears under the same prices even if there are no size constraints. From Fact 1, it follows all agents that get utility less than 1 in an HZ solution, will get the same utility in a CEEI/leximin/MNW solution. As for agents who get utility 1 in an HZ solution, they cannot get any more utility in a balanced assignment.

2 \iff 3 \iff 4 \iff 5:

The EPS rule of [Katta and Sethuraman \(2006\)](#) returns a balanced random assignment. Under dichotomous preferences, the EPS rule has a direct connection with the egalitarian rule proposed by [Bogomolnaia and Moulin \(2004\)](#) for two-sided matching problem with equal number of men and women with dichotomous preferences. If men are treated as items who are completely indifferent among women, then the setting studied by [Bogomolnaia and Moulin \(2004\)](#) reduces to the random assignment problem with one side having dichotomous preferences and the EPS rule coincides with the egalitarian rule of [Bogomolnaia and Moulin \(2004\)](#). The egalitarian rule of [Bogomolnaia and Moulin \(2004\)](#) is equivalent to the leximin rule on the set of balanced as-

signments. [Bogomolnaia and Moulin \(2004\)](#) also note that their egalitarian rule is equivalent to the MNW rule applied to the set of balanced assignments. Thus the equivalence between [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), and [5](#) follows from the papers of [Bogomolnaia and Moulin \(2004\)](#) and [Katta and Sethuraman \(2006\)](#).

[6](#) \iff [7](#) \iff [8](#):

We also know from [Fact 1](#) that under 1-0 utilities, MNW, CEEI, and leximin coincide. Therefore, [6](#), [7](#), and [8](#) are equivalent.

[2](#) \iff [6](#):

Consider an assignment x that is balanced and leximin among balanced assignments. Suppose it is not globally leximin. Then observe how a leximin assignment among balanced assignments is achieved during the run of the EPS algorithm. For all agents in bottleneck sets who get utility less than 1, their utilities are exactly the same as they would get in a globally leximin random assignment. The reason x is not a globally leximin assignment is that the last set of agents who exit the market get utility 1 but some of them could have got utility strictly more than 1 (without decreasing the utility of other agents) if the balancedness condition is not imposed. These items are not additionally allocated to the agents who already have utility 1 and these items are only distributed in [Step 10](#) of [Algorithm 1](#). It follows that assignment x can be achieved by first computing a balanced assignment that is leximin and then implementing the balancing operation on it.

This completes the proof. \square

A corollary of the theorem above is the following one.

Corollary 1. *For all HZ solutions under 1-0 utilities, each agent gets the same utility in all the solutions.*

Proof. We proved that under 1-0 utilities, the HZ solution is equivalent to applying the balancing operation to a CEEI solution. The utilities of each agent are invariant under all CEEI solutions. Hence, it follows that the utilities of each agent are invariant under all HZ solutions ([Vazirani, 2007](#)). \square

Next, we present the following theorem for the case of bi-valued utilities.

Theorem 2. *Under bi-valued utilities, the HZ rule is equivalent to*

1. *EPS rule*
2. *Egalitarian rule of [Bogomolnaia and Moulin \(2004\)](#) applied with respect to the binary-reduced utilities*
3. *Leximin applied with respect to the binary-reduced utilities to the set of balanced assignments*
4. *MNW applied with respect to the binary-reduced utilities to the set of balanced assignments*
5. *The rule that applies the balancing operation to a leximin solution (with respect to the binary-reduced utilities)*

6. *The rule that applies the balancing operation to a MNW solution (with respect to the binary-reduced utilities)*
7. *The rule that applies the balancing operation to a CEEI solution (with respect to the binary-reduced utilities).*

Proof. We know from Theorem 1 that HZ and EPS are equivalent under 1-0 utilities. Note that EPS is an ordinal algorithm so it gives the same outcome under dichotomous preferences. The same argument that is used to prove that EPS gives an HZ solution under 1-0 utilities can be used verbatim to prove that EPS gives an HZ solution under bi-valued utilities. At any point at which a bottleneck set X_k is removed, the agents in the set are able to get their most preferred items at the lowest price. Any most preferred items that are not available were sold at a higher price. As for lesser preferred items, they are given to the agents for free because they are the under-demanded items that are given price zero.

We have shown that HZ and EPS are equivalent under 1-0 utilities; EPS solutions are equivalent under 1-0 utilities and bi-valued utilities; and EPS under bi-valued utilities gives a HZ solution under bi-valued utilities. It follows that HZ under 1-0 utilities implies HZ under bi-valued utilities.⁵

Next, we prove that any HZ solution under bi-valued utilities is the HZ solution under binary-reduced utilities for the same item prices. Suppose there is an HZ solution under bi-valued utilities that is not an outcome of HZ under binary-reduced utilities. This means that the market does not clear under binary-reduced utilities for the same prices. For the base case, consider the items in O_1 in the corresponding EPS outcome. The agents X_1 pay nothing for the lesser preferred items. If some item in O_1 has a different price, then for the market to clear, at least some item in O_1 has lesser price. Consider the item $o \in O_1$ whose price dropped the most. But then all agents in X_1 who most prefer o want to get more of o which implies that the market does not clear. The same argument works inductively for the items in O_2, \dots, O_k . Hence, the market clears for binary-reduced utilities for the original prices which contradicts that the HZ solution under bi-valued utilities that is not an outcome of HZ under binary-reduced utilities.

The remaining equivalences follow from Theorem 1 that EPS is equivalent to the rules under 1-0 utilities. \square

Corollary 2. *For all HZ solutions under bi-valued utilities, the solution is rational. For a given problem instance with bi-valued utilities, each agent gets the same utility in all the solutions of the problem instance. Under bi-valued utilities, the set of HZ solutions does not change even if the agents' utilities are shifted or scaled.*

Proof. We have proved that HZ solutions under bi-valued utilities is equivalent to applying the balancing operation to a CEEI solution (with respect to the binary-

⁵ The proof is also an alternative argument that HZ under bi-valued utilities is invariant under scaling and shifting of the utility functions as their outcomes are equivalent to HZ under 1-0 utilities.

reduced utilities). It is well-known that the CEEI solution is always rational and, for the problem instance, each agent gets the same utility in all the solutions of the instance, and each item gets the same price in all the solutions of the instance. \square

The theorem above also has several algorithmic consequences. Firstly, in order to compute the HZ solution for bi-valued utilities, one only needs to consider the underlying dichotomous preferences and run the EPS algorithm. The characterizations combined with the EPS algorithm provide an alternative route to proving that the HZ solution can be computed in strongly polynomial time.

Corollary 3. *Under bi-valued utilities, the HZ solution can be computed in time $O(n^3 \log n)$.*

Proof. Computing the HZ solution reduces to computing the outcome of the EPS algorithm. EPS runs in $O(n^3 \log n)$ time. \square

Another algorithmic consequence is a reduction from HZ to CEEI in the case of bi-valued utilities.

Corollary 4. *There is a linear-time reduction from computing the HZ solution under bi-valued utilities to computing the MNW / CEEI / leximin solution under 1-0 utilities.*

Proof. The reduction is specified as Algorithm 2. \square

Our approach for turning HZ into a leximin problem that is oblivious to tracking prices can be seen as conceptually simpler.

Input: (N, O, u) where u is bi-valued
Output: A balanced assignment

- 1: Turn the bi-valued utilities u to binary reduced utilities u' .
- 2: Apply an algorithm for the (unconstrained) MNW/CEEI/lexi-min to utilities u' to compute a solution x .
- 3: Apply the balancing operation on x to derive the HZ outcome.
- 4: **return** x .

Algorithm 2: Reduction from HZ for bi-valued utilities to MNW/CEEI/leximin

We have already pointed out that in EPS, an agent who gets one unit of most-preferred items cannot get more even though he may be the only agent liking the additional item. Due to the adherence to the size constraints, the HZ solution may not be ex-ante Pareto optimal (PO) among the set of *all* assignments if we assume that agents have additive utilities. Assuming, we ask the agents to get the cheapest demand set, the HZ solution is PO among the set of balanced assignments. It may not be PO among the set of all assignments if we assume that agents have additive utilities.

We recall that CEEI is equivalent to the MNW rule. However, the HZ rule is not equivalent to maximizing Nash welfare while imposing equal size constraints. This is evident from Example 1 that showed that applying MNW to balanced assignments may give highly unfair assignments.

5 Strategyproofness

For all the rules that we have considered, we discuss issues around strategyproofness and group strategyproofness. A rule is *strategyproof* if no agent can misreport her preferences to get higher utility. A rule is *ex-ante group strategyproof* if no group of agents can misreport their preferences so that all agents in the group get at least as much utility and at least one agent in the group gets strictly more utility.

For dichotomous preferences, EPS is ex-ante group-strategyproof. This fact has been shown before as well (see, e.g. Theorem 1 of Katta and Sethuraman (2006) who refer to the argument by Bogomolnaia and Moulin (2004)). Group-strategyproofness for EPS is established by induction on the bottleneck sets created: it can be proved that no agent in a bottleneck set will be a member of a manipulating coalition. Hence, it follows that the HZ solution is also group-strategyproof under bi-valued utilities.⁶

Corollary 5. *Under bi-valued utilities, the HZ rule is group-strategyproof.*

For 1-0 utilities, all the rules leximin/MNW/CEEI that may return unbalanced assignments are group-strategyproof as well. See for example Theorem 3 of Aziz and Ye (2014) that shows that leximin/MNW/CEEI are group-strategyproof. Within the class of bi-valued utilities, it is clear that leximin is not strategyproof or envy-free: an agent with scaled-down utilities gets predominant importance under the leximin rule. On the other hand, scaling down of utilities has no effect in the case of MNW (equivalently CEEI). Despite resistance to manipulation by scaling, we show that MNW is not strategyproof under bi-valued utilities even if the underlying ordinal preferences remain unchanged. Previously, manipulations of the MNW and CEEI under general additive utilities have been considered in many papers (Brânzei et al., 2014, Chen et al., 2016).

Theorem 3. *Under bi-valued utilities, MNW/CEEI is not strategyproof even if the underlying ordinal preferences remain unchanged.*

Proof. We provide an example with 5 agents and 5 items.

| | o_1 | o_2 | o_3 | o_4 | o_5 |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 6 |
| 3 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 10 | 4 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

⁶ The HZ rule is not strategyproof for general utilities. See, for example, further discussion by Abebe et al. (2020).

Under the valuations, the MNW/CEEI outcome x is as follows.

$$\begin{matrix} & o_1 & o_2 & o_3 & o_4 & o_5 \\ \begin{matrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \end{matrix} & \left(\begin{matrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/12 & 1 & 1/12 & 0 \\ 0 & 11/12 & 0 & 11/12 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 \end{matrix} \right) \end{matrix}$$

Agent 1 gets utility 10.

Suppose agent 1 misreports as follows by raising her value for the lower preferred items.

| | o_1 | o_2 | o_3 | o_4 | o_5 |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 2 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 6 |
| 3 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 10 | 4 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Under the misreport, the MNW/CEEI outcome y is as follows.

$$\begin{matrix} & o_1 & o_2 & o_3 & o_4 & o_5 \\ \begin{matrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \end{matrix} & \left(\begin{matrix} 1 & 3/16 & 0 & 3/16 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 13/16 & 0 & 13/16 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 \end{matrix} \right) \end{matrix}$$

The assignment y gives agent 1 utility more than 10 with respect to her original utilities. Hence, MNW/CEEI is not strategyproof under bi-valued utilities. The computation of MNW solutions is via an optimisation solver. An analytical proof that the computation is correct is given below. Let

$$f_u(x) = \prod_{i \in N} \sum_{o_j \in O} u_{ij} x_{ij},$$

and define constraints (for all $i \in N$ and $o_j \in O$)

$$c_j(x) = \sum_{i' \in N} x_{i'j} - 1, \quad c_{ij}(x) = -x_{ij}.$$

Write

$$u_{-i}(x) = \prod_{k \in N \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{o_j \in O} u_{kj} x_{kj}$$

for the product of utilities, ignoring agent i . Then $\partial_{(ij)} f_u = u_{ij} u_{-i}$.

For the first example (truthful utilities), we find

$$u_{-1}(x) = 605/12, \quad u_{-2}(x) = 275/6, \quad u_{-3}(x) = 55/2, \quad u_{-4}(x) = u_{-5}(x) = 3025/3,$$

from which

$$\nabla f_u(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 3025/6 & 605/12 & 605/12 & 605/12 & 605/12 \\ 275 & 275 & 1375/3 & 275 & 275 \\ 110 & 275 & 110 & 275 & 110 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3025/3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3025/3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The gradient is a vector, but we write it in matrix form so we can directly relate each x_{ij} partial with the corresponding matrix entry. To find Lagrange multipliers and apply the KKT conditions, we only need to find the gradients of the active constraints. c_j for $1 \leq j \leq 5$ are active, so we find $[\nabla c_j(x)]_{ki} = \mathbb{I}_{k=j}$. That is, $\nabla c_j(x)$ is zero everywhere, except for every entry in column j , which are all 1. Then, we can calculate part of the Lagrangian,

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \nabla f_u(x) - 3025/6 \nabla c_1(x) - 275 \nabla c_2(x) \\ &\quad - 1375/3 \nabla c_3(x) - 275 \nabla c_4(x) - 3025/3 \nabla c_5(x) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -2695/12 & -4895/12 & -2695/12 & -11495/12 \\ -1375/6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2200/3 \\ -2365/6 & 0 & -1045/3 & 0 & -2695/3 \\ -3025/6 & -275 & -1375/3 & -275 & 0 \\ -3025/6 & -275 & -1375/3 & -275 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Now the remaining active constraints are precisely those c_{ij} with corresponding negative entries in this matrix, and since $\nabla c_{ij} = -\mathbf{e}_{ij}$, we can choose Lagrange multipliers for these extra gradients such that the Lagrangian gradient is zero, and these multipliers are negative. Specifically, the Lagrange multiplier for constraint c_{ij} is exactly M_{ij} . Since f_u is concave over the constrained set, which is convex, we have a concave optimisation problem. All Lagrangian multipliers of active inequality constraints are negative, so we satisfy the KKT conditions, and can conclude that x is a global maximum of f_u .

For the second example (misreported utilities), we find

$$u_{-1}(y) = 325/8, \quad u_{-2}(y) = 845/16, \quad u_{-3}(y) = 65/2, \quad u_{-4}(y) = u_{-5}(y) = 4225/4,$$

so that

$$\nabla f_u(y) = \begin{pmatrix} 1625/4 & 325 & 325 & 325 & 325 \\ 2535/8 & 2535/8 & 4225/8 & 2535/8 & 2535/8 \\ 130 & 325 & 130 & 325 & 130 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4225/4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4225/4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
M &= \nabla f_u(y) - 1625/4 \nabla c_1(y) - 325 \nabla c_2(y) \\
&\quad - 4225/8 \nabla c_3(y) - 325 \nabla c_4(y) - 4225/4 \nabla c_5(y) \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1625/8 & 0 & -2925/4 \\ -715/8 & -65/8 & 0 & -65/8 & -5915/8 \\ -1105/4 & 0 & -3185/8 & 0 & -3705/4 \\ -1625/4 & -325 & -4225/8 & -325 & 0 \\ -1625/4 & -325 & -4225/8 & -325 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar analysis gives that y is a global maximiser of f_u . □

The theorem above can be recast in the context of indivisible goods to state that for bi-valued utilities, the MNW rule of [Caragiannis et al. \(2016\)](#) is not strategyproof for any tie-breaking over the set of possible outcomes. The MNW rule of [Caragiannis et al. \(2016\)](#) for indivisible goods coincides with MNW for divisible goods if the goods are made arbitrarily small.

Corollary 6. *Under bi-valued utilities, and for indivisible goods, the MNW rule of [Caragiannis et al. \(2016\)](#) is not strategyproof for any tie-breaking over the set of possible outcomes.*

The argument follows from the observation that each divisible good can be approximately modelled as small enough multiple indivisible goods.

6 The Curious Case of the Nash Bargaining Rule

In this section, we consider the Nash Bargaining rule that is very similar to several rules analyzed in the paper including MNW, CEEL, and HZ. We show that despite its close connections with these rules, it does not exhibit the same properties even under binary utilities. A *Nash bargaining (NB)* solution with disagreement point $\{d_i\}_{i \in N}$ is a solution $x^* \in \mathcal{F}_b$ to the optimisation problem

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{x \in \mathcal{F}_b} \prod_{i \in N} \left(\sum_{o_j \in O} u_{ij} x_{ij} - d_i \right); \\
&\text{s.t. } d_i - \sum_{o_j \in O} u_{ij} x_{ij} \leq 0, \\
&\quad \sum_{i \in N} x_{ij} - 1 \leq 0, \\
&\quad -x_{ij} \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

We will use the disagreement point

$$d_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{o_j \in O} u_{ij},$$

referred to as uniform disagreement, as it comes from utilities achieved from a uniform allocation. The uniform agreement is standard (see e.g., (Abebe et al., 2020)). Abebe et al. (2020) refer to NB as the benchmark for strong efficiency and fairness guarantees. One appealing aspect of NB is that it is invariant to shifting and scaling of reported utilities.

We first observe the NB is very similar in spirit to MNW, CEEI, and HZ. It is the same as MNW except that it takes into account the uniform disagreement point and restricts its attention to balanced assignments. We have already discussed the close links between MNW with CEEI and HZ. Next we show that whereas MNW (equivalently CEEI) and HZ are envy-free and strategyproof for 1-0 utilities, NB fails both properties. In order to prove the results, we use the following characterization of NB that holds under 1-0 utilities. The characterization states that, under 1-0 utilities, computing NB is equivalent to leximin optimisation with respect to the differences between agent utilities and their disagreement points.

Lemma 1. *Under 1-0 utilities, any balanced allocation that is leximin-optimal with respect to the disagreement point is an NB solution.*

Proof. It is known that under 1-0 utilities, an improvement in the Nash welfare results in a leximin improvement and a leximin improvement results in an improvement in the Nash welfare (see e.g., (Halpern et al., 2020)). The fact holds if we interpret each agent’s utility as the difference between her real utility and her disagreement point utility. \square

Next, we prove that NB is not strategyproof even for 1-0 utilities. The fact that it is not strategyproof for general cardinal utilities was already known (see for example the discussion of Abebe et al. (2020)). Our key insight for the case of 1-0 utilities is that agents can benefit from expanding their set of liked items to artificially get a higher demand. Then their disagreement point increases, ensuring they get more allocated to them, and the item they do not actually like is higher-demanded, so the excess leans towards the item they like instead.

Theorem 4. *Even under 1-0 utilities, the Nash bargaining solution is not strategyproof.*

Proof. Suppose truthful utilities were given by

| | o_1 | o_2 | o_3 | o_4 | o_5 |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

but agent 2 misreports so the reported utility profile is actually

| | o_1 | o_2 | o_3 | o_4 | o_5 |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Under these profiles, NB solutions respectively are

$$x = \begin{matrix} & o_1 & o_2 & o_3 & o_4 & o_5 \\ \begin{matrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 \\ 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix},$$

and

$$x^* = \begin{matrix} & o_1 & o_2 & o_3 & o_4 & o_5 \\ \begin{matrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 9/20 & 0 & 0 & 11/20 & 0 \\ 11/20 & 1/10 & 0 & 7/20 & 0 \\ 0 & 9/20 & 0 & 1/10 & 9/20 \\ 0 & 9/20 & 0 & 0 & 11/20 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}.$$

Under truthful reporting, agent 2 gets utility of $1/2$, but under the misreported utilities, they get utility of $11/20$. Thus NB is not strategyproof, even under 1-0 utilities.

It remains to show that x and x^* are actually NB solutions. For x , this is simple. The lexicographic utilities with respect to the disagreement point are

$$(3/10, 3/10, 3/10, 3/10, 7/10).$$

Since agents 1 and 2 only like item 1, and have exhausted its demand, any increase in either's utility will decrease that of the other agent. Similarly for agents 3 and 4. Agent 5 has reached the demand constraint, so they cannot increase their utility at all. Thus, the allocation is leximin-optimal with respect to the disagreement point, and hence an NB solution.

For x^* , our lexicographic utilities with respect to the disagreement point are

$$(1/4, 1/4, 1/4, 1/4, 7/10).$$

Since object 1 and 2 are both exhausted of supply:

1. Attempting to increase agent 1's utility will decrease agent 2's.
2. Attempting to increase agent 3 or 4's utility will decrease the other's or agent 2's.
3. Attempting to increase agent 2's utility will decrease agent 1, 3, or 4's utility.

Again, agent 5 has reached the demand constraint, so they cannot increase their utility at all. Thus, the allocation is leximin-optimal with respect to the disagreement point, and hence an NB solution. \square

Next we prove that NB violates envy-freeness even under 1-0 utilities. The result is especially surprising because MNW and HZ both have close links with NB, but do satisfy envy-freeness, even for general cardinal utilities.

Theorem 5. *Even under 1-0 utilities, a Nash bargaining solution is not always envy-free.*

Proof. In the proof of Theorem 4, agent 1 envies agent 2 in the allocation x^* . \square

We expect that the negative results that we have proved for NB also carry over if we consider any other disagreement point.

7 Conclusions

The assignment problem is one of the most fundamental and widely-encountered allocation problems. In this paper, we provided a deeper understanding of the strong links as well as subtle differences between various well-known rules encountered in the literature. One of our main contributions is a unification of the literature by proving the equivalence of several rules under binary and bi-valued utilities. We also show that the well-known Nash bargaining rule fails envy-freeness even under 1-0 utilities which was not known in the literature (to the best of our knowledge). We envisage further work on the topic both in terms of algorithm design as well as further understanding of the tradeoffs between axiomatic properties.

Bibliography

- R. Abebe, R. Cole, V. Gkatzelis, and J. D. Hartline. A truthful cardinal mechanism for one-sided matching. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 2096–2113, 2020.
- H. Aziz and C. Ye. Cake cutting algorithms for piecewise constant and piecewise uniform valuations. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Internet and Network Economics (WINE)*, pages 1–14, 2014.
- H. Aziz, F. Brandt, and P. Stursberg. On popular random assignments. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Symposium on Algorithmic Game Theory (SAGT)*, volume 8146 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (LNCS)*, pages 183–194. Springer-Verlag, 2013.
- H. Aziz, F. Brandt, M. Brill, and J. Mestre. Computational aspects of random serial dictatorship. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges*, 13(2):26–30, 2014.
- H. Aziz, M. Brill, V. Conitzer, E. Elkind, R. Freeman, and T. Walsh. Justified representation in approval-based committee voting. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 48(2):461–485, 2017.

- S. Barman, S. K. Krishnamurthy, and R. Vaish. Greedy algorithms for maximizing Nash social welfare. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems (AAMAS)*, 2018.
- A. Bogomolnaia and H. Moulin. A new solution to the random assignment problem. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 100(2):295–328, 2001.
- A. Bogomolnaia and H. Moulin. Random matching under dichotomous preferences. *Econometrica*, 72(1):257–279, 2004.
- A. Bogomolnaia, H. Moulin, and R. Stong. Collective choice under dichotomous preferences. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 122(2):165–184, 2005.
- S. J. Brams and P. C. Fishburn. *Approval Voting*. Springer-Verlag, 2nd edition, 2007.
- S. Brânzei, Y. Chen, X. Deng, A. Filos-Ratsikas, Søren Kristoffer Stiil Frederiksen, and Jie Zhang. The fisher market game: Equilibrium and welfare. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, July 27 -31, 2014, Québec City, Québec, Canada*, pages 587–593, 2014.
- E. Budish. The combinatorial assignment problem: Approximate competitive equilibrium from equal incomes. *Journal of Political Economy*, 119(6):1061–1103, 2011.
- I. Caragiannis, D. Kurokawa, H. Moulin, A. D. Procaccia, N. Shah, and J. Wang. The Unreasonable Fairness of Maximum Nash Welfare. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (ACM-EC)*, pages 305–322, 2016.
- N. Chen, X. Deng, B. Tang, and H. Zhang. Incentives for strategic behavior in fisher market games. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, February 12-17, 2016, Phoenix, Arizona, USA*, pages 453–459, 2016. URL <http://www.aaai.org/ocs/index.php/AAAI/AAAI16/paper/view/12300>.
- Y. Chen, J. K. Lai, D. C. Parkes, and A. D. Procaccia. Truth, justice, and cake cutting. In *Proceedings of the 24th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, pages 756–761. AAAI Press, 2010.
- A. Filos-Ratsikas, S. K. S. Frederiksen, and J. Zhang. Social welfare in one-sided matchings: Random priority and beyond. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Symposium on Algorithmic Game Theory (SAGT)*, pages 1–12, 2014.
- D. Halpern, A. D. Procaccia, A. Psomas, and N. Shah. Fair division with binary valuations: One rule to rule them all. Technical report, 2020.
- A. Hylland and R. Zeckhauser. The efficient allocation of individuals to positions. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 87(2):293–314, 1979.
- A.-K. Katta and J. Sethuraman. A solution to the random assignment problem on the full preference domain. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 131(1):231–250, 2006.
- T. Kavitha, J. Mestre, and M. Nasre. Popular mixed matchings. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412(24):2679–2690, 2011.
- H. Moulin. *Fair Division and Collective Welfare*. The MIT Press, 2003.
- J. Sethuraman. Mechanism design for house allocation problems: A short introduction. *OPTIMA: Mathematical Programming Society Newsletter*, pages 2–8, 2010.

- H. R. Varian. Equity, envy, and efficiency. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 9:63–91, 1974.
- V. V. Vazirani. Combinatorial algorithms for market equilibria. In N. Nisan, T. Roughgarden, É. Tardos, and V. Vazirani, editors, *Algorithmic Game Theory*, chapter 5, pages 103–134. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- V. V. Vazirani and M. Yannakakis. Computational Complexity of the Hylland-Zeckhauser Scheme for One-Sided Matching Markets. *CoRR*, abs/2004.01348, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.01348>.