

Approximately EFX Allocations for Indivisible Chores

Shengwei Zhou *

Xiaowei Wu *

Abstract

In this paper we study how to fairly allocate a set of m indivisible chores to a group of n agents, each of which has a general additive cost function on the items. Since envy-free (EF) allocation is not guaranteed to exist, we consider the notion of envy-freeness up to any item (EFX). In contrast to the fruitful results regarding the (approximation of) EFX allocations for goods, very little is known for the allocation of chores. Prior to our work, for the allocation of chores, it is known that EFX allocations always exist for two agents, or general number of agents with IDO cost functions. For general instances, no non-trivial approximation result regarding EFX allocation is known. In this paper we make some progress in this direction by showing that for three agents we can always compute a 5-approximation of EFX allocation in polynomial time. For $n \geq 4$ agents, our algorithm always computes an allocation that achieves an approximation ratio of $O(n^2)$ regarding EFX.

1 Introduction

Fairness is receiving increasing attention in a broad range of research fields, including but not limited to computer science, economics and mathematics. A fair allocation problem focuses on allocating a set of items to a group of agents, where different agents may have different valuation functions on the items. When the valuation functions give positive values, the items are considered as goods, e.g., resources; when the valuation functions give negative values, the items are considered as chores, e.g., tasks. In the later case we refer to the valuation functions as cost functions. Arguably two of the most well-studied fairness notions are *envy-freeness* (EF) [23] and *proportionality* (PROP) [32]. Proportionality means that each agent received at least her proportional share of all items. Envy-freeness is even stronger. Informally speaking, an allocation is EF if no agent wants to exchange her bundle of items with another agent in order to increase her utility. In contrast to the case of divisible items, where EF and PROP allocations always exist [1, 21, 8], when items are indivisible, they are not guaranteed to exist even for some simple cases. For example, consider allocating a single indivisible item to two agents. This example also defies approximations of EF and PROP allocation. Therefore, researchers have turned their attention to relaxations of these fairness notions. *Envy-free up to one item* (EF1) [29] and *envy-free up to any item* (EFX) [14] are two widely studied relaxations of EF. Informally speaking, an EF1 allocation requires that the envy between any two agents can be eliminated by removing some item; while an EFX allocation requires that the envy can be eliminated by removing any item.

It has been shown that EF1 allocations are guaranteed to exist and can be found in polynomial time for goods [29], chores and even mixture of the two [12]. However, EF1 could sometimes lead to extremely unfairness, even if a much fairer allocation exists. EFX, on the other hand, puts a much stronger constraint on the allocation and is arguably the most compelling fairness notion. There are fruitful results regarding the existence and computation of (approximations of) EFX allocations since the notion was first proposed by Caragiannis et al.[14]. For the allocation of goods, it has been shown that EFX allocations exist for

*IOTSC, University of Macau, China. {yc17423,xiaoweiwu}@um.edu.mo

two agents with general valuations and any number of agents with identical ordering (IDO) valuations [31], and recently for three agents [17]. It remains a fascinating open problem whether EFX allocations always exist in general. For general number of agents with additive valuations, there are efficient algorithms for the computation of $1/2$ -approximate EFX allocations [31, 16] and 0.618 -approximate EFX allocations [4].

In contrast to the allocation of goods, very little regarding EFX allocations for chores is known to this day. It can be easily shown that the divide-and-choose algorithm computes an EFX allocation when there are two agents with general valuations. Very recently, it is shown that EFX allocations always exist for IDO instances [28]. However, even for three agents with general additive valuations, it is unknown whether constant approximations of EFX allocations exist, let alone the existence of EFX allocations.

1.1 Main Results

In this paper, we propose polynomial-time algorithms for the computation of approximately EFX allocations for indivisible chores. For three agents, our algorithm achieves an approximation ratio of 5 while for $n \geq 4$ agents the approximation ratio is $O(n^2)$. Prior to our work, no non-trivial results regarding the approximation of EFX allocation for chores are known, except for some special cases [28].

Result 1 (Theorem 3.1). *There exists a polynomial time algorithm that computes a 5-approximate EFX allocation for three agents with additive valuations.*

Result 2 (Theorem 4.1). *There exists a polynomial time algorithm that computes an $O(n^2)$ -approximate EFX allocation for $n \geq 4$ agents with additive valuations.*

While being two seemingly similar problems, the EFX allocations of goods and chores admit distinct difficulties in approximability. For the allocation of goods, while computing an EFX allocation seems difficult, getting a constant approximation ratio turns out to be quite straightforward. Existing algorithms [4, 31] for the computation of approximately EFX allocation for goods follow the common framework of *Sequential Picking* equipped with the *Envy-Cycle Elimination* technique [29, 12]. Roughly speaking, in these algorithms, in each round an “un-envied” agent will be chosen to pick her favourite unallocated item, where the envy-cycle elimination technique ensures that there will always be an un-envied agent in each round. The result of [28] also follows this framework to compute an EFX allocation for chores on IDO instances. The key to the analysis is by showing that the value/cost of an agent increases by at most a small constant factor in each round. However, it seems quite challenging to extend this framework to handle general instances for the allocation of chores. For the allocation of goods, it can be shown that the utilities of agents are non-decreasing in each round: the picking operation and envy-cycle elimination do not decrease the value of any agent. In contrast, for the allocation of chores, when an agent picks an item, its cost increases; when an envy-cycle is eliminated, the cost of the involved agents decreases. This introduces a main difficulty in computing an (approximation of) EFX allocation for chores: if the cost of an agent is very small when it picks an item with large cost, the approximation ratio of EFX can be arbitrarily bad.

To get around this main difficulty, we adopt a completely different approach in dividing the items. Our first observation is that when all items have small costs to all agents, then there is likely to exist a partition that looks “even” to all agents. To handle this case, we propose the Round-Robin Placement algorithm, which computes a partition of the items for a group of agents such that the ratios between the cost of any two bundles are bounded, under every agent’s cost function. On the other hand, if there exists an item e that has large cost to an agent i , then by allocation the item to some other agent j , we can ensure that agent i does not seriously envy agent j , no matter what items agent i received eventually. Our algorithms rely on a careful combination of the above two observations. For three agents, we show that by classifying the agents into different types depending on the number of large items they have, we are able to get a 5-approximate EFX allocation. To extend the ideas to general number agents, we borrow some existing techniques for the computation of PROP1 allocation for goods [29], and bound the approximation ratio by $O(n^2)$.

1.2 Other Related Works

For the allocation of goods, there are also works that study partial EFX allocations, i.e., EFX allocations with some of the items unallocated. To name a few, Chaudhury et al. [19] show that EFX allocations exist if we are allowed to leave at most $n - 1$ items unallocated. The result has recently been improved to $n - 2$ items by Berger et al. [11]. They also show that an EFX allocation that leaves at most one item unallocated exists for four agents. Very recently, Chaudhury et al. [18] show that a $(1 - \epsilon)$ -approximate EFX allocation with sublinear number of unallocated goods and high Nash welfare exists. It remains unknown whether similar results hold for the allocation of chores.

Besides EFX, there are other well-studied fairness notions, e.g., MMS [13] and PROPX [30], for the allocation of chores. While it has been shown that MMS allocations are not guaranteed to exist for indivisible chores [10], there are many works that study its approximations [10, 7, 6, 26]. The state-of-the-art approximation ratio for MMS allocation for indivisible chores is $11/9$ by Huang and Lu [26]. Regarding PROPX allocations, in contrast to the allocation of goods, where PROPX allocation is not guaranteed to exist [30, 9], it is shown that PROPX allocation always exists and can be computed efficiently for chores [28].

2 Preliminaries

We consider how to fairly allocate a set of m indivisible chores M to a group of n agents N . A bundle is a subset of items $X \subseteq M$. An allocation is represented by a n -partition $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ of the items, where $X_i \cap X_j = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$ and $\cup_{i \in N} X_i = M$. In allocation \mathbf{X} , agent $i \in N$ received bundle X_i . Each agent $i \in N$ has an additive cost function $c_i : 2^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$. That is, for any $i \in N$ and $X \subseteq M$, $c_i(X) = \sum_{e \in X} c_i(\{e\})$.

When there is no confusion, we use c_{ie} and $c_i(e)$ to denote $c_i(\{e\})$ for convenience. Further, given any set $X \subseteq M$ and $e \in M$, we use $X + e$ and $X - e$ to denote $X \cup \{e\}$ and $X \setminus \{e\}$, respectively.

Definition 2.1 (α -EFX). *For any $\alpha \geq 1$, an allocation \mathbf{X} is α -approximate envy-free up to any item (α -EFX) if for any $i, j \in N$ and any $e \in X_i$,*

$$c_i(X_i - e) \leq \alpha \cdot c_i(X_j).$$

When $\alpha = 1$, the allocation \mathbf{X} is EFX.

Without loss of generality, we assume that all cost functions are normalized. That is, for any $i \in N$, $c_i(M) = 1$. Let $\sigma_i(j)$ be the j -th most costly item under c_i (with tie broken deterministically, e.g., by item ID). In other words, for all agent $i \in N$, we have

$$c_i(\sigma_i(1)) \geq c_i(\sigma_i(2)) \geq \dots \geq c_i(\sigma_i(m)).$$

For each agent $i \in N$, we define $M_i^- = \{\sigma_i(j) : j \geq n\}$ as the set of *tail items*. Observe that we have $|M_i^-| = m - n + 1$ and $c_i(e) \geq c_i(e')$ for all $e \notin M_i^-$ and $e' \in M_i^-$. With this observation, we show that for every instance there exists a simple allocation that is $(m - n)$ -EFX.

Lemma 2.2. *There exists a $(m - n)$ -EFX allocation for every instance with m items and n agents.*

Proof. Fix an arbitrary agent, e.g., agent n , and define the allocation as follows. For all $i < n$, let $X_i = \{\sigma_n(i)\}$. Let $X_n = M_n^-$ be the set containing the remaining items. Obviously, the resulting allocation is EFX for all agents $i < n$ since $|X_i| = 1$. By the definition of M_n^- , for every $e \in M_n^-$, every $i < n$, we have

$$c_n(M_n^- - e) \leq (m - n) \cdot c_n(\sigma_n(i)) = (m - n) \cdot c_n(X_i)$$

Consequently, the allocation is $(m - n)$ -EFX. □

Unfortunately the above approximation ratio is large, especially when m is large and n is small. In the following sections, we present algorithms that compute allocations with approximations of EFX that depends only on n . In particular, our algorithm computes a 5-EFX allocation when $n = 3$ and $O(n^2)$ -EFX allocation for $n \geq 4$.

3 5-EFX Allocation for Three Agents

In this section we present the algorithm that computes a 5-EFX allocation when $n = 3$. The ideas we use to compute the allocation in this part inspires our design of approximation algorithm for general n .

Theorem 3.1. *There exists a polynomial-time algorithm that computes a 5-EFX allocation for three agents.*

Given an allocation \mathbf{X} , we say that agent i envies agent j if $c_i(X_i) > c_i(X_j)$; *strongly-envies* agent j if there exists $e \in X_i$ such that $c_i(X_i - e) > 5 \cdot c_i(X_j)$. In other words, an allocation is 5-EFX if and only if no agent strongly-envies another agent. For three agents we have $M_i^- = M \setminus \{\sigma_i(1), \sigma_i(2)\}$ for all $i \in N$. Observe that if there exists an agent $i \in N$ with $c_i(M_i^-) \leq 5 \cdot c_i(\sigma_i(2))$, then by allocating $\sigma_i(1)$ and $\sigma_i(2)$ to the other two agents and M_i^- to agent i , we end up having a 5-EFX allocation (following an analysis similar to the proof of Lemma 2.2). Hence it suffices to consider the case in which every agent $i \in N$ has

$$c_i(M_i^-) > 5 \cdot c_i(\sigma_i(2)).$$

In other words, item $\sigma_i(2)$ (and thus every item other than $\sigma_i(1)$) is “small” to agent i in the sense that it contributes at most a $1/6$ fraction to the total cost of $M - \sigma_i(1)$. Depending on whether $\sigma_i(1)$ has large cost, we classify the agents into two types: large agent and small agent.

Definition 3.2 (Large/Small Agent). *We call agent $i \in N$ a large agent if $c_i(\sigma_i(1)) \geq 1/8$; small otherwise.*

The main intuition behind the definition is as follows. Recall that we are aiming for a 5-EFX allocation. For a large agent i , if $\sigma_i(1) \in X_j$ for some agent $j \neq i$, then as long as $c_i(X_i) \leq 5/8$, agent i does not strongly-envy agent j , even if $|X_j| = 1$. On the other hand, for a small agent i , every item $e \in M$ has cost $c_i(e) < 1/8$. Thus we can partition the items into bundles of roughly the same cost, under c_i , so that no matter which of these bundles agent i eventually receives, she will not strongly-envy any other agent.

Following the above intuitions, we proceed by considering how many small agents there are.

3.1 At Least Two Small Agents

We first consider the case when there are at least two small agents. Without loss of generality, suppose agent 1 and 2 are small. Agent 3 can be either small or large.

Lemma 3.3. *We can compute in polynomial-time a 3-partition (S_1, S_2, S_3) of M such that for both $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we have $c_i(S_j) \in [1/8, 5/8]$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.*

Note that Lemma 3.3 immediately implies Theorem 3.1 when there are at least two small agents for the following reasons. Since the costs of the three bundles S_1, S_2 and S_3 differ by a factor of at most 5, agent 1 and 2 will not strongly-envy any other agent as long as every agent gets exactly one bundle. Therefore, by letting agent 3 pick her favourite bundle, i.e., the one with minimum $c_3(S_j)$, and allocating the remaining two bundles to agents 1 and 2 arbitrarily, we end up with a 5-EFX allocation: agent 3 does not envy agents 1 and 2; agents 1 and 2 do not strongly-envy any other agent.

Thus it remains to give the polynomial-time algorithm for the computation of (S_1, S_2, S_3) . The main idea behind the algorithm is quite simple: since agents 1 and 2 have small costs on every item, round-robin like algorithms should work in computing such a partition.

The Algorithm. We initialize S_j as an empty bundle for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Then we let agents 1 and 2 take turns to put the unallocated item with maximum cost into the bundle with smallest cost, both under her own cost function, until all items are allocated (refer to Algorithm 1).

Algorithm 1: Round Robin Placement

- 1 Initialize: $S_j \leftarrow \emptyset$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $P \leftarrow M$ and $k \leftarrow 1$;
- 2 **while** $P \neq \emptyset$ **do**
- 3 let $e^* \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}\{c_k(e) : e \in P\}$ and $j^* \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}\{c_k(S_j) : j \in \{1, 2, 3\}\}$;
- 4 $S_{j^*} \leftarrow S_{j^*} + e^*$, $P \leftarrow P - e^*$;
- 5 $k \leftarrow (k \bmod 2) + 1$;

Output: (S_1, S_2, S_3)

Next we show that for both $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we have $c_i(S_j) \in [1/8, 5/8]$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

Proof of Lemma 3.3: Fix any $i \in \{1, 2\}$, say $i = 1$. We assume w.l.o.g. that $c_1(S_1) \leq c_1(S_2) \leq c_1(S_3)$. We show that $c_1(S_3) \leq 5/8$ and $c_1(S_1) \geq 1/8$. Recall that each agent allocates one item to some bundle in each round. We say that it is agent i 's round if during this round agent i gets to allocate an item to one of the bundles.

Consider the last item agent 1 allocates an item to the bundle S_3 , and let t be the *next* agent 1's round. If agent 1 never assigns any item to S_3 , then let t be the first agent 1's round. In other words, t is defined as the earliest agent 1's round such that starting from round t , agent 1 never assigns any item to bundle S_3 . Let S'_1, S'_2, S'_3 be the three bundles at the beginning of round t . Let $P = M \setminus (S'_1 \cup S'_2 \cup S'_3)$ be the set of unallocated items at this moment.

- If t is the first agent 1's round, then we have $c_1(S'_3) \leq 1/8$, since at most one item is allocated and each item has cost at most $1/8$ under c_1 .
- Otherwise, since agent 1 allocates one item to S_3 in the previous agent 1's round, we know that at the beginning of that round, the cost of bundle S_3 is the minimum among the three. Thus we have

$$c_1(S'_3) \leq c_1(S'_1) + 2 \times 1/8 = c_1(S'_1) + 1/4, \quad (1)$$

since at most one item is allocated in each round.

In both case we have $c_1(S'_3) \leq c_1(S'_1) + 1/4$.

Let P_1 (resp. P_2) be the set of items in P that are allocated by agent 1 (resp. 2). Note that all these items are allocated at or after round t . Since agent 1 allocates the items from the most costly to the least, we have $c_1(P_1) \geq c_1(P_2)$. We first give an upper bound on $c_1(S_3)$.

Claim 3.1. We have $c_1(S'_3) + c_1(P_2) \leq 5/8$.

Proof. Recall that

$$c_1(P_2) \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot c_1(P) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot (1 - c_1(S'_1) - c_1(S'_2) - c_1(S'_3)).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(S'_3) + c_1(P_2) &\leq c_1(S'_3) + \frac{1}{2} \cdot (1 - c_1(S'_1) - c_1(S'_2) - c_1(S'_3)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot (c_1(S'_3) - c_1(S'_1)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{4} = \frac{5}{8}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (1). □

Recall that all items in $S_3 \setminus S'_3$ are allocated by agent 2 after round t , by Claim 3.1 we have

$$c_1(S_3) \leq c_1(S'_3) + c_1(P_2) \leq \frac{5}{8}.$$

Next we give a lower bound for $c_1(S_1)$. If agent 1 allocates all items in P_1 to S_1 , then we have

$$c_1(S_1) \geq c_1(S'_1) + c_1(P_1) \geq c_1(S'_3) - \frac{1}{4} + c_1(P_2) \geq c_1(S_3) - \frac{1}{4}.$$

Consequently we have (recall that $c_1(S_2) \leq c_1(S_3)$)

$$1 = c_1(S_1) + c_1(S_2) + c_1(S_3) \leq 3 \cdot c_1(S_1) - \frac{1}{2},$$

which gives $c_1(S_1) \geq 1/6 > 1/8$.




Figure 1: An illustration of the assignment of items in the three bundles, where the items within each bundle are ordered by the time they are included, and the items in the shaded areas belong to P_2 .

Otherwise we consider the last item $e \in P_1$ agent 1 allocates to S_2 (see Figure 1 for an illustrative example). Let S'_1 and S'_2 be the two bundles right before the allocation. Note that $S'_1 \subseteq S''_1$, $S'_2 \subseteq S''_2$ and we have $c_1(S'_1) \geq c_1(S'_2)$. Since e is the last item agent 1 allocates to S_2 , we know that all items in $S_2 \setminus (S'_2 + e)$ are from P_2 . Also recall that after time t , agent 1 did not assign any item to S_3 . In other words, all items in $S_3 \setminus S'_3$ are from P_2 . Thus we have

$$M \setminus (S_1 \cup S'_2 \cup \{e\}) \subseteq S_3 \cup P_2 = S'_3 \cup P_2.$$

By Claim 3.1 we have

$$1 - c_1(S_1) - c_1(S'_2) - c_1(e) \leq c_1(S'_3) + c_1(P_2) \leq \frac{5}{8}.$$

Since $c_1(S_1) \geq c_1(S'_1) \geq c_1(S'_2)$, we have

$$c_1(S_1) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot (1 - \frac{5}{8} - c_1(e)) \geq \frac{1}{8},$$

where the second inequality holds due to $c_1(e) \leq 1/8$. ■

3.2 One Small Agent

Next we consider the case when there is exactly one small agent, say agent 3. Let $e_1 = \sigma_1(1)$ and $e_2 = \sigma_2(1)$ be the most costly item under c_1 and c_2 , respectively. Note that since agents 1 and 2 are large, we have $c_1(e_1) \geq 1/8$ and $c_2(e_2) \geq 1/8$.

If $e_1 = e_2$, then we can compute a 4-EFX easily as follows. Let $X_3 = \{e_1\}$, and we compute an EFX allocation (X_1, X_2) between agents 1 and 2 on items $M - e_1$. In this allocation agent 3 obviously does not strongly-envy agents 1 and 2 because $|X_3| = 1$, and agents 1 and 2 do not envy each other by more than one item. On the other hand, since (X_1, X_2) is an EFX allocation on items $M - e_1$, by removing any item e from X_1 (resp. X_2), we have $c_1(X_1 - e) \leq 1/2$ (resp. $c_2(X_2 - e) \leq 1/2$). Since $c_1(X_3) = c_1(e_1) \geq 1/8$ and $c_2(X_3) = c_2(e_2) \geq 1/8$, the allocation is 4-EFX.

If $e_1 \neq e_2$, then we use the fact that agent 3 is a small agent to compute an allocation that is fair to all as follows. Let $M^- = M - e_1 - e_2$. Note that we have $c_3(M^-) \geq 3/4$ since items e_1 and e_2 have cost at most $1/8$ under c_3 . We first compute an EFX allocation (S_1, S_2, S_3) for three agents under cost function c_3 , on items M^- . Consequently for every $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ we have

$$c_3(M^-) = c_3(S_1) + c_3(S_2) + c_3(S_3) \leq 3 \cdot c_3(S_i) + 2 \times \frac{1}{8},$$

which implies $c_3(S_i) \geq \frac{1}{3} \cdot (c_3(M^-) - \frac{1}{4}) \geq \frac{1}{6}$.

Allocation. Assume w.l.o.g. that $c_1(S_1) \leq c_1(S_2) \leq c_1(S_3)$, we decide the allocation \mathbf{X} as follows. Let $X_1 = S_1 + e_2$, let agent 2 pick a bundle between $S_2 + e_1$ and S_3 ; then agent 3 gets the remaining bundle.

We show that the resulting allocation is 4-EFX.

- Agent 3 does not strongly-envy agent 1 and 2 because $\min\{c_3(X_1), c_3(X_2)\} \geq 1/6$, which implies

$$c_3(X_3) \leq 4/6 \leq 4 \cdot \min\{c_3(X_1), c_3(X_2)\}.$$

- Agent 2 does not envy agent 3 because she gets to pick a bundle between $S_2 + e_1$ and S_3 , while agent 3 gets the other bundle. For the same reason we also have $c_2(X_2) \leq 1/2$. Agent 2 does not strongly-envy agent 1 because $c_2(X_1) \geq c_2(e_2) \geq 1/8$.
- Agent 1 does not envy bundle $S_2 + e_1$ because $c_1(S_1) \leq c_1(S_2)$ and $c_1(e_2) \leq c_1(e_1)$. Agent 1 does not strongly-envy bundle S_3 because $c_1(S_1) \leq c_1(S_3)$ and

$$c_1(e_2) \leq \frac{1}{5} \cdot c_1(M_1^-) \leq \frac{1}{5} \cdot c_1(M^-) \leq c_1(S_3),$$

where the last inequality holds since S_3 is the most costly bundle among $\{S_1, S_2, S_3\}$, e.g., $c_1(S_3) \geq \frac{1}{3} \cdot c_1(M^-)$. Thus no matter which bundle agent 2 picks, the resulting allocation is 4-EFX.

3.3 All Agents are Large

Finally, we consider the case when all agents are large. Let $e_1 = \sigma_1(1)$, $e_2 = \sigma_2(1)$ and $e_3 = \sigma_3(1)$. By definition we have $c_1(e_1) \geq 1/8$, $c_2(e_2) \geq 1/8$ and $c_3(e_3) \geq 1/8$.

As before, if there exist two of $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ that are the same item, say $e_1 = e_2$, then we can easily compute an 4-EFX by assigning e_1 to X_3 and computing an EFX allocation between agent 1 and 2 on the remaining items. Hence we assume e_1, e_2 and e_3 are three different items, and let $M^- = M \setminus \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$.

Allocation. Let $X_3 = \{e_1, e_2\}$. We first compute an EFX allocation (S_1, S_2) on items M^- under cost function c_1 . Assume w.l.o.g. that $c_3(S_1) \leq c_3(S_2)$. We let agent 2 pick a bundle between $S_1 + e_3$ and S_2 , and assign the other bundle to agent 1.

We show that the resulting allocation is 4-EFX.

- Agent 3 does not strongly-envy bundle $S_1 + e_3$ because $c_3(X_3) \leq 2 \cdot c_3(e_3)$. Agent 3 does not envy bundle S_2 because

$$c_3(S_2) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot c_3(M^-) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{4}{5} \cdot c_3(M_3^-) \geq \frac{2}{5} \cdot c_3(M_3^-) \geq c_3(X_3),$$

where the second and third inequality hold since all items other than e_3 are small, i.e., have cost at most $\frac{1}{5} \cdot c_3(M_3^-)$ to agent 3.

- Agent 2 does not envy agent 1 because she gets to pick first. Agent 2 does not strongly-envy agent 3 because $c_2(X_2) \leq 1/2$ while $c_2(X_3) \geq c_2(e_2) \geq 1/8$.
- Recall that agent 1 gets the bundle in $\{S_1 + e_3, S_2\}$ that is not picked by 2. Moreover, $S_1 \cup S_2 = M^-$ and (S_1, S_2) is an EFX allocation under c_1 . Since every item $e \neq e_1$ has cost $c_1(e) \leq \frac{1}{5} \cdot c_1(M_1^-)$, we have $c_1(M^-) \geq \frac{4}{5} \cdot c_1(M_1^-)$. Thus $c_1(e) \leq \frac{1}{4} \cdot c_1(M^-)$ for every $e \in M^-$. Consequently, we have

$$\max\{c_1(S_1), c_1(S_2)\} \leq \frac{5}{8} \cdot c_1(M^-) \quad \text{and} \quad \min\{c_1(S_1), c_1(S_2)\} \geq \frac{3}{8} \cdot c_1(M^-),$$

because otherwise $c_1(S_1) - c_1(S_2) > \frac{1}{4} \cdot c_1(M_1^-)$, which contradicts the fact that (S_1, S_2) is an EFX partition. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{c_1(S_1 + e_3), c_1(S_2)\} &\leq \frac{5}{8} \cdot c_1(M^-) + \frac{1}{5} \cdot c_1(M_1^-) \\ &\leq \frac{7}{8} \cdot c_1(M^-) \leq 3 \cdot \min\{c_1(S_1 + e_3), c_1(S_2)\}. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, agent 1 does not strongly-envy agent 2. In the following, we show that for all $e \in X_1$ we have $c_1(X_1 - e) \leq 1/2$. If $X_1 = S_2$ then the claim is trivially true because (S_1, S_2) is an EFX partition of M^- . Otherwise we have $X_1 = S_1 + e_3$. If $e = e_3$, then

$$c_1(X_1 - e) = c_1(S_1) \leq c_1(S_2 + e_1).$$

If $e \neq e_3$, then we have

$$c_1(X_1 - e) = c_1(S_1 - e) + c_1(e_3) \leq c_1(S_2 + e_1).$$

In both case we have $c_1(X_1 - e) \leq c_1(S_2 + e_3)$. Since $X_1 = S_1 + e_3$ and $S_2 + e_2$ are disjoint, we have

$$c_1(X_1 - e) \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot (c_1(X_1 - e) + c_1(S_2 + e_3)) \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Since $c_1(X_3) \geq c_1(e_1) \geq 1/8$, agent 1 does not strongly-envy agent 3 either.

In summary, in all cases we can compute a 5-EFX allocation for three agents in polynomial-time, which proves Theorem 3.1. From the above analysis we observe that it is crucial to distinguish whether an item e is large to an agent i : if it is, then by allocating the item to another agent j who values it small, we can eliminate the strong envy from i to j ; if it is not, then putting item e in X_i does not hurt the approximation ratio too much.

In the following section, we show how these ideas can be extended to the general case when $n \geq 4$.

4 General Number of Agents

In this section, we give a polynomial-time algorithm that computes an $O(n^2)$ -EFX allocation for any given instance with $n \geq 4$ agents.

Theorem 4.1. *There exists a polynomial-time algorithm that computes a $3n^2$ -EFX allocation for any instance with n agents.*

For each agent $i \in N$, we define $M_i^- = \{\sigma_i(j) : j \geq n\}$. As before (refer to Lemma 2.2 for a formal analysis), if there exists an agent i with $c_i(M_i^-) \leq 3n^2 \cdot c_i(\sigma_i(n-1))$, then we can easily compute a $3n^2$ -EFX allocation by allocating exactly one item in $M \setminus M_i^-$ to each agent in $N - i$, and assigning the remaining items M_i^- to agent i . Since each agent other than i receives only one item, and agent i receives a set of items with total cost at most $3n^2$ times the cost of any other agent, the allocation is $3n^2$ -EFX.

In the following we say that agent i strongly-envies agent j if for some $e \in X_i$ it holds $c_i(X_i - e) > 3n^2 \cdot c_i(X_j)$.

4.1 The Allocation Algorithm

We define $b_i = \frac{1}{3n^2 - n + 2} \cdot c_i(M_i^-)$, and let $L_i = \{e \in M : c_i(e) \geq b_i\}$ be the set of *large* items of agent i . Note that by the above discussion we have $|L_i| \leq n - 2$ for all $i \in N$. The main intuition behind the definition of large items is as follows. Our algorithm will compute an allocation $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ ensuring that for each agent $i \in N$, either $X_i \cap L_i = \emptyset$, i.e., no large item in L_i is assigned to agent i ; or $|X_i| = 1$. We show that as long as no large item is assigned to agent i , i does not strongly-envy any other agent that receives at least one item in L_i .

Lemma 4.2. *For any agent $i \in N$, if $X_i \cap L_i = \emptyset$ and $L_i \cap X_j \neq \emptyset$, then i does not strongly-envy agent j .*

Proof. By definition each item $e \in L_i$ has cost

$$c_i(e) \geq b_i = \frac{1}{3n^2 - n + 2} \cdot c_i(M_i^-).$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_i(X_i) &\leq c_i(M \setminus L_i) = c_i(M_i^-) + c_i(M \setminus (M_i^- \cup L_i)) \\ &\leq (3n^2 - n + 2) \cdot c_i(X_j) + (n - 2) \cdot c_i(X_j) \\ &\leq 3n^2 \cdot c_i(X_j), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because X_j contains at least one item that is large to agent i , and there are at most $n - 2$ items that are not included in $M_i^- \cup L_i$, all of which are small to agent i . \square

Remark. A few difficulties arise when we try to extend the ideas we develop for three agents to general number of agents. First, for a large number of agents, it is no longer feasible to classify agents depending on how many large items they have because there are too many cases. Instead, our new algorithm removes the large items of each agent, and treat all agents as “small agents”. Second, even if all agents have no large items, i.e., $L_i = \emptyset$ for all $i \in N$, it is not clear how to extend the Round Robin Placement algorithm (Lemma 3.3) to compute $O(n)$ subsets with upper and lower bounded costs for general number of agents. To get around this, we borrow existing results for the PROP1 allocation of goods, and show that when items are small to the agents, we can partition the items into $O(n)$ bundles such that the ratio between the costs of any two bundles are bounded by $O(n^2)$.

Let $L = \cup_{i \in N} L_i$ be the set of items that are large to at least one agent. Let $K = \cap_{i \in N} L_i$. Note that each item $e \in K$ is large to all agents. Let $M^- = M \setminus L$ be the set of items that are small to all agents.

Claim 4.1. For each $i \in N$ and $e \in M^-$, we have $c_i(e) \leq \frac{1}{2n^2+2n} \cdot c_i(M^-)$.

Proof. Recall that item $e \in M^-$ is small to agent i . Thus

$$c_i(e) \leq b_i = \frac{1}{3n^2 - n + 2} \cdot c_i(M_i^-).$$

Moreover, we have $M_i^- \setminus (\cup_{j \in (N-i)} L_j) \subseteq M^-$. Since there are at most $(n-1) \cdot (n-2)$ items in $\cup_{j \in (N-i)} L_j$, and each of them has cost at most b_i to agent i , we have

$$c_i(M^-) \geq c_i(M_i^-) - (n-1) \cdot (n-2) \cdot b_i \geq (2n^2 + 2n) \cdot b_i. \quad (2)$$

By the above lower bound on $c_i(M^-)$, we have $c_i(e) \leq b_i \leq \frac{1}{2n^2+2n} \cdot c_i(M^-)$. \square

Recall that now we have three sets of items K , M^- and $L \setminus K$, each of which will be handled as follows.

- Since each item in K is large to all agents, we assign each of them to a unique agent chosen arbitrarily. Let N^* be these agents, and $N^- = N \setminus N^*$. Note that $|N^*| = |K|$. Our algorithm will not assign any further items to agents in N^* . Obviously these agents do not envy any other agents by more than one item. Moreover, if we can ensure that in the final allocation $X_i \cap L_i = \emptyset$ for all $i \in N^-$, then no agent strongly-envies any agent in N^* , by Lemma 4.2.
- By Claim 4.1, for all agent i , all items in M^- have small cost compared to $c_i(M^-)$. We show in Lemma 4.3 that we can partition the items in M^- to into $|N^-|$ bundles evenly under every cost function of agents, and assign them to the agents in N^- . The key to the computation of the partition is to ensure that each bundle has a considerably large cost to every agent in N^- .
- It remains to assign items in $L \setminus K$. Recall that these are items that are large to some agent but not to all agents. Our algorithm assigns each $e \in L \setminus K$ to an arbitrary agent i for which $e \notin L_i$.

Lemma 4.3. Given a set of items M^- and a group of agents N^- such that for all $i \in N^-$ and $e \in M^-$,

$$c_i(e) \leq \frac{1}{2n^2 + 2n} \cdot c_i(M^-),$$

there exists a partition $(S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{|N^-|})$ of M^- such that for all $i, j \in N^-$,

$$c_i(S_j) \geq \frac{1}{2n^2 + 2n} \cdot c_i(M^-).$$

Proof. Let $N^- = \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$. Our goal is to partition M^- into (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_t) such that for all $i, j \in N^-$, $c_i(S_j) \geq \frac{1}{2n^2+2n} \cdot c_i(M^-)$. Since we need to partition the items into bundles whose cost is lower bounded, it is natural to borrow ideas from the allocation of goods.

In particular, we treat items in M^- as goods, where each agent i has value $c_i(e)$ on item $e \in M^-$. Then we compute a t -partition $\mathbf{Q} = (Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_t)$ of M^- that is PROP1 using the Round Robin algorithm [29]. The fairness notion PROP1 is defined as follows. An allocation \mathbf{Q} of items M^- to agents N^- is PROP1 if for all $i \in N^-$, there exists $e \in M^- \setminus Q_i$ such that $c_i(Q_i + e) \geq \frac{1}{n} \cdot c_i(M^-)$.

Since each $e \in M^-$ has cost $c_i(e) \leq \frac{1}{2n^2+2n} \cdot c_i(M^-)$ to agent i , we have

$$c_i(Q_i) \geq \frac{1}{n} \cdot c_i(M^-) - \frac{1}{2n^2 + 2n} \cdot c_i(M^-) \geq \frac{2n + 1}{2n^2 + 2n} \cdot c_i(M^-).$$

However, \mathbf{Q} is not the desired partition since $c_i(Q_j)$ can be arbitrarily small, for some $j \neq i$. Thus for each $i \in N^-$ we further compute a t -partition $(Q_{i1}, Q_{i2}, \dots, Q_{it})$ of Q_i that is PROP1 under c_i . Again, since each $e \in Q_i$ has $c_i(e) \leq \frac{1}{2n^2+2n} \cdot c_i(M^-)$, for each $j \leq t$ we have

$$c_i(Q_{ij}) \geq \frac{1}{n} \cdot c_i(Q_i) - \frac{1}{2n^2+2n} \cdot c_i(M^-) \quad (3)$$

$$\geq \frac{2+1/n-1}{2n^2+2n} \cdot c_i(M) \geq \frac{1}{2n^2+2n} \cdot c_i(M^-), \quad (4)$$

where the second inequality follows from Equation (4.1).

Finally, we regroup the bundles $\{Q_{ij}\}_{i,j \in N^-}$ into t bundles: let $S_j = \cup_{i=1}^t Q_{ij}$ for each $j \in N^-$. By Equation (4), for any $i, j \in N^-$, we have

$$c_i(S_j) \geq c_i(Q_{ij}) \geq \frac{1}{2n^2+2n} \cdot c_i(M^-),$$

which concludes the proof of Lemma 4.3. \square

4.2 The Approximation Ratio

In this section we show that no agent strongly-envies another agent. From the previous analysis, we know that agents in N^* do not envy any other agent by more than one item, and agents in N^- does not strongly-envy agents in N^* . It remains to show that agents in N^* do not strongly-envy each other. Recall that each agent $i \in N^-$ receives a bundle S_i (see Lemma 4.3), and possibly some other items from $L \setminus K$ that are small to agent i . By Lemma 4.3, for every $j \in N^-$ we have $c_i(X_j) \geq \frac{1}{2n^2+2n} \cdot c_i(M^-)$.

Next we give an upper bound on $c_i(X_i)$. Since there are at most $(n-1) \cdot (n-2)$ items in $L \setminus K$ that are small to agent i , we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_i(X_i) &\leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2n^2+2n}\right) \cdot c_i(M^-) + (n-1) \cdot (n-2) \cdot b_i \\ &\leq \frac{2n^2+2n-1}{2n^2+2n} \cdot c_i(M^-) + \frac{n^2-3n+2}{2n^2+2n} \cdot c_i(M^-) \\ &\leq \frac{3n^2-n+1}{2n^2+2n} \cdot c_i(M^-) \leq \frac{3n^2}{2n^2+2n} \cdot c_i(M^-), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Equation (2). Combining the upper bound on $c_i(X_i)$ and lower bound on $c_i(X_j)$, we have $c_i(X_i) \leq 3n^2 \cdot c_i(X_j)$ for any $i, j \in N^-$. Hence agents in N^* do not strongly-envy each other.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper we propose algorithms that always compute a 5-EFX allocation for three agents and $3n^2$ -EFX allocation for $n \geq 4$ agents. These are the first approximation ratios of EFX that are independent of m for the allocation of indivisible chores. There are many open problems regarding the computation of approximately EFX allocation for chores. For example, it would be interesting to investigate whether constant approximations of EFX allocation exist for general number of agents, and whether EFX allocations exist for three agents. We observe that to ensure (approximation of) EFX for an agent i , we often need to focus on increasing the costs of other agents, instead of minimizing the cost of i , which can possibly lead to inefficiency in the final allocation. It is thus interesting to study the existence of allocations for chores that are fair, e.g., approximation of EFX, MMS or PROPX, and efficient, e.g., Pareto optimal.

References

- [1] N. Alon. Splitting necklaces. *Advances in Mathematics*, 63(3):247–253, 1987.
- [2] G. Amanatidis, G. Birmpas, A. Filos-Ratsikas, A. Hollender, and A. A. Voudouris. Maximum nash welfare and other stories about EFX. In *IJCAI*, pages 24–30. ijcai.org, 2020.
- [3] G. Amanatidis, G. Birmpas, and E. Markakis. On truthful mechanisms for maximin share allocations. In *IJCAI*, pages 31–37. IJCAI/AAAI Press, 2016.
- [4] G. Amanatidis, E. Markakis, and A. Ntokos. Multiple birds with one stone: Beating $1/2$ for EFX and GMMS via envy cycle elimination. In *AAAI*, pages 1790–1797. AAAI Press, 2020.
- [5] H. Aziz, H. Chan, and B. Li. Weighted maxmin fair share allocation of indivisible chores. In *IJCAI*, pages 46–52. ijcai.org, 2019.
- [6] H. Aziz, B. Li, and X. Wu. Strategyproof and approximately maxmin fair share allocation of chores. In *IJCAI*, pages 60–66. ijcai.org, 2019.
- [7] H. Aziz, B. Li, and X. Wu. Approximate and strategyproof maximin share allocation of chores with ordinal preferences. *CoRR*, abs/2012.13884, 2020.
- [8] H. Aziz and S. Mackenzie. A discrete and bounded envy-free cake cutting protocol for any number of agents. In *FOCS*, pages 416–427. IEEE Computer Society, 2016.
- [9] H. Aziz, H. Moulin, and F. Sandomirskiy. A polynomial-time algorithm for computing a pareto optimal and almost proportional allocation. *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 48(5):573–578, 2020.
- [10] H. Aziz, G. Rauchecker, G. Schryen, and T. Walsh. Algorithms for max-min share fair allocation of indivisible chores. In *AAAI*, pages 335–341. AAAI Press, 2017.
- [11] B. Berger, A. Cohen, M. Feldman, and A. Fiat. (almost full) EFX exists for four agents (and beyond). *CoRR*, abs/2102.10654, 2021.
- [12] U. Bhaskar, A. R. Sricharan, and R. Vaish. On approximate envy-freeness for indivisible chores and mixed resources. *CoRR*, abs/2012.06788, 2020.
- [13] E. Budish. The combinatorial assignment problem: Approximate competitive equilibrium from equal incomes. *Journal of Political Economy*, 119(6):1061–1103, 2011.
- [14] I. Caragiannis, D. Kurokawa, H. Moulin, A. D. Procaccia, N. Shah, and J. Wang. The unreasonable fairness of maximum nash welfare. *ACM Trans. Economics and Comput.*, 7(3):12:1–12:32, 2019.
- [15] M. Chakraborty, A. Igarashi, W. Suksompong, and Y. Zick. Weighted envy-freeness in indivisible item allocation. In *AAMAS*, pages 231–239. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2020.
- [16] H. Chan, J. Chen, B. Li, and X. Wu. Maximin-aware allocations of indivisible goods. In *AAMAS*, pages 1871–1873. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2019.
- [17] B. R. Chaudhury, J. Garg, and K. Mehlhorn. EFX exists for three agents. In *EC*, pages 1–19. ACM, 2020.

- [18] B. R. Chaudhury, J. Garg, K. Mehlhorn, R. Mehta, and P. Misra. Improving EFX guarantees through rainbow cycle number. In *EC*, pages 310–311. ACM, 2021.
- [19] B. R. Chaudhury, T. Kavitha, K. Mehlhorn, and A. Sgouritsa. A little charity guarantees almost envy-freeness. In *SODA*, pages 2658–2672. SIAM, 2020.
- [20] V. Conitzer, R. Freeman, and N. Shah. Fair public decision making. In *EC*, pages 629–646. ACM, 2017.
- [21] F. Edward Su. Rental harmony: Sperner’s lemma in fair division. *The American mathematical monthly*, 106(10):930–942, 1999.
- [22] A. Farhadi, M. Ghodsi, M. T. Hajiaghayi, S. Lahaie, D. M. Pennock, M. Seddighin, S. Seddighin, and H. Yami. Fair allocation of indivisible goods to asymmetric agents. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 64:1–20, 2019.
- [23] D. Foley. Resource allocation and the public sector. *Yale Economic Essays*, pages 45–98, 1967.
- [24] D. Halpern and N. Shah. Fair and efficient resource allocation with partial information. *CoRR*, abs/2105.10064, 2021.
- [25] X. Huang and P. Lu. An algorithmic framework for approximating maximin share allocation of chores. *CoRR*, abs/1907.04505, 2019.
- [26] X. Huang and P. Lu. An algorithmic framework for approximating maximin share allocation of chores. In *EC*, pages 630–631. ACM, 2021.
- [27] D. Kurokawa, A. D. Procaccia, and J. Wang. Fair enough: Guaranteeing approximate maximin shares. *J. ACM*, 65(2):8:1–8:27, 2018.
- [28] B. Li, Y. Li, and X. Wu. Almost proportional allocations for indivisible chores. *CoRR*, abs/2103.11849, 2021.
- [29] R. J. Lipton, E. Markakis, E. Mossel, and A. Saberi. On approximately fair allocations of indivisible goods. In *EC*, pages 125–131. ACM, 2004.
- [30] H. Moulin. Fair division in the internet age. *Annual Review of Economics*, 11(1):407–441, 2019.
- [31] B. Plaut and T. Roughgarden. Almost envy-freeness with general valuations. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 34(2):1039–1068, 2020.
- [32] H. Steihaus. The problem of fair division. *Econometrica*, 16:101–104, 1948.