

Weighted Fairness Notions for Indivisible Items Revisited

Mithun Chakraborty,¹ Erel Segal-Halevi,² Warut Suksompong³

¹ Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Michigan, USA

² Department of Computer Science, Ariel University, Israel

³ School of Computing, National University of Singapore, Singapore

Abstract

We revisit the setting of fairly allocating indivisible items when agents have different weights representing their entitlements. First, we propose a parameterized family of relaxations for weighted envy-freeness and the same for weighted proportionality; the parameters indicate whether smaller-weight or larger-weight agents should be given a higher priority. We show that each notion in these families can always be satisfied, but any two cannot necessarily be fulfilled simultaneously. We then introduce an intuitive weighted generalization of maximin share fairness and establish the optimal approximation of it that can be guaranteed. Furthermore, we characterize the implication relations between the various weighted fairness notions introduced in this and prior work, and relate them to the lower and upper quota axioms from apportionment.

1 Introduction

Research in fair division is quickly moving from the realm of theory to practical applications, ranging from the division of various assets between individuals (Goldman and Procaccia 2014) to the distribution of food to charities (Aleksandrov et al. 2015) and medical equipment among communities (Pathak et al. 2021). Two complicating factors in such applications are that items may be *indivisible*, and recipients may have *different entitlements*. For example, when dividing food packs or medical supplies among organizations or districts, it is reasonable to give larger shares to recipients that represent more individuals. This raises the need to define appropriate fairness notions taking these factors into account.

With divisible resources and equal entitlements, two well-established fairness benchmarks are *envy-freeness*—no agent prefers the bundle of another agent, and *proportionality*—every agent receives at least $1/n$ of her value for the set of all resources, where n denotes the number of agents. When the resources consist of indivisible items, neither of these benchmarks can always be met, for example if one item is extremely valuable in the eyes of all agents. This has motivated various relaxations, which can be broadly classified into two approaches. The first approach allows adding or removing a single item before applying the fairness notion. In particular, *envy-freeness up to one item (EF1)* requires that if an agent envies another agent, the envy should disappear upon removing one item from the envied agent’s bundle

(Lipton et al. 2004; Budish 2011). *Proportionality up to one item (PROP1)* demands that if an agent falls short of the proportionality benchmark, this should be rectified after adding one item to her bundle (Conitzer, Freeman, and Shah 2017). The second approach modifies the fairness threshold itself: instead of $1/n$ of the total value, the threshold becomes the *maximin share (MMS)*, which is the maximum value that an agent can ensure herself by partitioning the items into n parts and receiving the worst part (Budish 2011). The existence guarantees with respect to these relaxations are quite well-understood by now—an allocation satisfying EF1 and PROP1 always exists, and even though the same is not true for MMS fairness, there is always an allocation that gives every agent a constant fraction of her MMS (Ghodsi et al. 2018; Kurokawa, Procaccia, and Wang 2018; Garg and Taki 2021).

Recently, there have been several attempts to extend these approximate notions to agents with different entitlements. However, the resulting notions have been shown to exhibit a number of unintuitive and perhaps unsatisfactory features. In the “fairness up to one item” approach, EF1 has been generalized to *weighted EF1 (WEF1)* (Chakraborty et al. 2020) and PROP1 to *weighted PROP1 (WPROP1)* (Aziz, Moulin, and Sandomirskiy 2020). Yet, even though (weighted) envy-freeness implies (weighted) proportionality and EF1 implies PROP1, Chakraborty et al. (2020) have shown that, counterintuitively, WEF1 does not imply WPROP1. Moreover, while it is always possible to satisfy each of the two notions separately, these authors have demonstrated that it may be impossible to satisfy both simultaneously. In the “share-based” approach, MMS has been generalized to *weighted MMS (WMMS)* (Farhadi et al. 2019). A disadvantage of WMMS is that computing its value for an agent requires knowing not only the agent’s own entitlement, but also the entitlements of all other agents. In addition, the definition of WMMS is rather difficult to understand and explain (especially when compared to MMS), thereby making it less likely to be adopted in practice.

In this paper, we expand and deepen our understanding of weighted fair division for indivisible items by generalizing existing weighted fairness notions, introducing new ones, and exploring the relationships between them. Along the way, we propose solutions to the aforementioned issues of existing notions, and uncover a wide range of features of

the weighted setting that are not present in the unweighted case typically studied in the fair division literature.¹

1.1 Our contributions

As is commonly done in fair division, we assume throughout the paper that agents have additive utilities. In **Section 3**, we focus on fairness up to one item. The role of envy-freeness relaxations is to provide an upper bound on the amount of envy that is allowed between agents. In the unweighted setting, EF1 from agent i towards agent j requires that i 's envy is at most i 's highest utility for an item in j 's bundle. Formally, denoting i 's utility function by u_i and j 's bundle by A_j , the envy should be at most $\max_{g \in A_j} u_i(g)$. In the weighted setting, however, envy is measured by comparing the scaled utilities $u_i(A_i)/w_i$ and $u_i(A_j)/w_j$. Therefore, one could reasonably argue that the amount of allowed envy should be similarly scaled to be either $u_i(g)/w_i$ or $u_i(g)/w_j$; the first scaling corresponds to (hypothetically) adding the value of g to A_i while the second scaling corresponds to removing the value of g from A_j . Clearly, the first scaling yields a smaller envy-allowance if and only if $w_i > w_j$, so it favors agents with larger weights, while the second scaling favors those with smaller weights. We generalize both extremes at once by defining the allowed envy to be a *weighted average* of the two quantities, i.e., $u_i(g) \cdot (x/w_j + y/w_i)$ for $x + y = 1$. We denote this envy-freeness relaxation by $\text{WEF}(x, y)$. Similarly, we define $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$ as a relaxation of proportionality.

For a fixed $x + y$, a higher x yields a stronger guarantee (e.g., low envy-allowance) for lower-entitlement agents, while a lower x yields a stronger guarantee for higher-entitlement agents. We show that $\text{WEF}(x, y)$ implies $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$ for all x, y . WEF1 corresponds to $\text{WEF}(1, 0)$ while WPROP1 corresponds to $\text{WPROP}(0, 1)$; this provides an explanation as well as a resolution of the counterintuitive fact that WEF1 is incompatible with WPROP1 . With equal entitlements, $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ is equivalent to EF1 and $\text{WPROP}(x, 1 - x)$ is equivalent to PROP1 for all $x \in [0, 1]$. But with different entitlements, the conditions obtained for different values of x are different and incompatible. For each $x \in [0, 1]$, $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$, and therefore $\text{WPROP}(x, 1 - x)$, can always be satisfied. On the other hand, for any distinct $x, x' \in [0, 1]$, an allocation that fulfills both $\text{WPROP}(x, 1 - x)$ and $\text{WPROP}(x', 1 - x')$ may not exist, and an analogous impossibility result holds for WEF relaxations.

In **Section 4**, we explore share-based fairness notions. We propose a new weighted generalization of MMS called *normalized MMS (NMMS)*, which is simply the MMS of an agent scaled by the agent's weight. Not only is NMMS intuitive, but its definition also depends only on the relative entitlement of the agent in question (that is, the entitlement of the agent divided by the sum of entitlements), rather than on the entire vector of entitlements. We show that the best approximation factor that can always be at-

tained for NMMS is $1/n$, matching the WMMS guarantee of Farhadi et al. (2019). As with WMMS, the $1/n$ -NMMS guarantee can be achieved using the (unweighted) round-robin algorithm, with the agents taking turns in decreasing order of their weights. Interestingly, however, we show that WEF1 also implies $1/n$ -NMMS—this means that a weighted round-robin algorithm as well as a generalization of Barman, Krisnamurthy, and Vaish (2018)'s market-based algorithm, which are known to ensure WEF1 , also provide the worst-case optimal approximation of NMMS. In addition, we establish relations between several fairness notions, thereby extending the work of Amanatidis, Birmpas, and Markakis (2018) to the weighted setting.

In **Section 5**, we consider the case of identical items, also known as *apportionment* (Balinski and Young 2001). In this case, if the items were divisible, it would be clear that each agent should receive exactly the *quota* proportional to her weight. Hence, two important desiderata in apportionment are that each agent should obtain at least her *lower quota* (the quota rounded down), and at most her *upper quota* (the quota rounded up). We show that $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ guarantees lower quota if and only if $x = 0$ and upper quota if and only if $x = 1$, whereas WMMS, NMMS, and $\text{WPROP}(x, 1 - x)$ for any $x \in [0, 1]$ do not guarantee either quota. Similarly, the *maximum weighted Nash welfare* rule does not always respect either quota. Nevertheless, we introduce a new allocation rule, called *weighted egalitarian (WEG)*, which aims to maximize the leximin vector of the agents' utilities, with a carefully chosen normalization. We show that, in contrast to all other rules and notions studied herein, the WEG rule satisfies both quotas. This indicates that the egalitarian approach may be worthy of further study in settings with different entitlements.

2 Preliminaries

We consider a setting with a set $N = [n]$ of agents and a set $M = [m]$ of items, where $n \geq 2$ and $[k] := \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ for each positive integer k . A subset of items is called a *bundle*. The *entitlement* or *weight* of each agent $i \in N$ is denoted by $w_i > 0$. For any subset of agents $N' \subseteq N$, we denote $w_{N'} := \sum_{i \in N'} w_i$. An *allocation* $A = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)$ is a partition of M into n bundles such that bundle A_i is assigned to agent i . Each agent $i \in N$ has a *utility function* u_i , which we assume to be additive. This means that for any $M' \subseteq M$, $u_i(M') = \sum_{j \in M'} u_i(\{j\})$. For simplicity, we will sometimes write $u_i(j)$ instead of $u_i(\{j\})$ for $j \in M$.

3 Fairness Up to One Item

In this section, we define the envy-freeness and proportionality relaxations $\text{WEF}(x, y)$ and $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$, and study them particularly for the case where $x + y = 1$.

3.1 Weighted envy-freeness notions

We define a continuum of weighted envy-freeness relaxations parameterized by two nonnegative real values, x and y . We require that for any pair of agents i and j , for some item in j 's bundle, after removing an x fraction of the value

¹For an overview of previous work on weighted fair division of indivisible items, we refer to the related work sections of (Babaioff, Ezra, and Feige 2021) and (Chakraborty, Schmidt-Kraepelin, and Suksompong 2021).

of this item and adding a y fraction of this value to i 's bundle, i does not envy j . Formally:

Definition 3.1 (WEF(x, y)). For $x, y \in [0, 1]$, an allocation (A_1, \dots, A_n) is said to satisfy WEF(x, y) if for any $i, j \in N$, there exists $B \subseteq A_j$ with $|B| \leq 1$ such that²

$$\frac{u_i(A_i) + y \cdot u_i(B)}{w_i} \geq \frac{u_i(A_j) - x \cdot u_i(B)}{w_j}.$$

Equivalently, the condition can be stated in terms of the maximum allowed weighted envy:

$$\frac{u_i(A_j)}{w_j} - \frac{u_i(A_i)}{w_i} \leq \left(\frac{y}{w_i} + \frac{x}{w_j} \right) \cdot u_i(B).$$

WEF(x, y) generalizes and interpolates between several previously studied notions. In particular, WEF(0, 0) is the same as weighted envy-freeness, WEF(1, 0) is equivalent to the notion WEF1 proposed by Chakraborty et al. (2020), and WEF(1, 1) corresponds to what these authors called ‘‘transfer weighted envy-freeness up to one item’’. The WEF1 condition of Chakraborty et al. (2020) is strictly weaker than WEF($x, 1 - x$) for every $x \in [0, 1]$; see Appendix A.1.

WEF(x, y) requires that the *weighted envy* of i towards j , defined as $\max \left\{ 0, \frac{u_i(A_j)}{w_j} - \frac{u_i(A_i)}{w_i} \right\}$, should be at most $\left(\frac{y}{w_i} + \frac{x}{w_j} \right) \cdot u_i(B)$. It is evident that, with equal entitlements, this condition depends only on the sum $x + y$; in particular, whenever $x + y = 1$, WEF(x, y) is equivalent to EF1. However, with different entitlements, every selection of x, y , even with $x + y = 1$, leads to a different condition: a higher x yields a stronger guarantee (i.e., lower allowed envy) for agent i when $w_i < w_j$, while a higher y yields a stronger guarantee for the agent when $w_i > w_j$. This raises two natural questions. First, for what values of x, y can WEF(x, y) be guaranteed? Second, is it possible to guarantee WEF(x, y) for multiple pairs (x, y) simultaneously?

For the first question, whenever $x + y < 1$, a standard example of two agents with equal weights and one valuable item shows that WEF(x, y) cannot always be satisfied. We will show next that WEF(x, y) can always be satisfied when $x + y = 1$, thereby implying existence for $x + y > 1$ as well. To this end, we characterize picking sequences³ whose output is guaranteed to satisfy WEF($x, 1 - x$); this generalizes the WEF(1, 0) characterization of Chakraborty, Schmidt-Kraepelin, and Suksompong (2021, Thm. 3.1). For brevity, we say that a picking sequence satisfies a fairness notion if its output always satisfies that notion. The proof of this theorem, along with all missing proofs of this section, can be found in Appendix A.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $x \in [0, 1]$. A picking sequence π satisfies WEF($x, 1 - x$) if and only if for every prefix P of π and*

²We use a set $B \subseteq A_j$ with $|B| \leq 1$ instead of an item $g \in A_j$ in order to handle the case where $A_j = \emptyset$.

³A *picking sequence* is a sequence (p_1, \dots, p_m) where $p_i \in N$ for each i . The *output* of a picking sequence is the allocation resulting from the process in which, in the i -th turn, agent p_i picks her favorite item from the remaining items, breaking ties in a consistent manner (for example, in favor of lower-numbered items).

every pair of agents i, j , where agent i has t_i picks in P and agent j has t_j picks in P , we have $t_i + (1 - x) \geq \frac{w_i}{w_j} \cdot (t_j - x)$.

We can now prove that a WEF($x, 1 - x$) allocation exists in every instance.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $x \in [0, 1]$. Consider a picking sequence π such that in each turn, the pick is assigned to an agent i with the smallest $\frac{t_i + (1 - x)}{w_i}$, where t_i is the number of times agent i has picked so far. Then, π satisfies WEF($x, 1 - x$).*

Proof. Consider any pair of agents i, j . It suffices to show that after every pick of agent j , the condition in Theorem 3.2 is satisfied. Suppose that after j 's pick, the two agents have picked t_i and t_j times. Since j was assigned the pick, it must be that $\frac{t_j + (1 - x)}{w_j} - 1 \leq \frac{t_i + (1 - x)}{w_i}$. In other words, we have $t_i + (1 - x) \geq \frac{w_i}{w_j} \cdot (t_j - x)$, as desired. \square

In particular, Webster's apportionment method, which corresponds to the picking sequence in Theorem 3.3 with $x = 1/2$, satisfies WEF(1/2, 1/2). This strengthens a result of Chakraborty, Schmidt-Kraepelin, and Suksompong (2021) that the method guarantees WEF1.

While every WEF($x, 1 - x$) notion can be satisfied on its own, it is unfortunately impossible to guarantee WEF($x, 1 - x$) for two different values of x . We prove this strong incompatibility result even for the weaker notion of WPROP(x, y), which we define next.

3.2 Weighted proportionality notions

Similarly to WEF(x, y), we define a continuum of weighted proportionality relaxations.

Definition 3.4 (WPROP(x, y)). For $x, y \in [0, 1]$, an allocation (A_1, \dots, A_n) is said to satisfy WPROP(x, y) if for any $i \in N$, there exists $B \subseteq M \setminus A_i$ with $|B| \leq 1$ such that

$$\frac{u_i(A_i) + y \cdot u_i(B)}{w_i} \geq \frac{u_i(M) - n \cdot x \cdot u_i(B)}{w_N},$$

or equivalently,

$$u_i(A_i) \geq \frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot u_i(M) - \left(\frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot n \cdot x + y \right) \cdot u_i(B).$$

WPROP(0, 0) is the same as weighted proportionality, while WPROP(0, 1) is equivalent to the notion WPROP1 put forward by Aziz, Moulin, and Sandomirskiy (2020). As noted above, an equivalent condition is that, if the utility that agent i derives from her bundle is less than her (*weighted*) *proportional share* $\frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot u_i(M)$, then the amount by which it falls short should not exceed $\left(\frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot n \cdot x + y \right) \cdot u_i(B)$.

The factor n can be thought of as a normalization factor, since B is removed from the entire set of items M , which is distributed among n agents, rather than from another agent's bundle as in the definition of WEF(x, y). This normalization ensures that, similarly to the WEF(x, y) family, when all entitlements are equal, WPROP(x, y) reduces to PROP1 whenever $x + y = 1$. With different entitlements and $x + y = 1$, a higher x yields a stronger guarantee for agent i (i.e., the agent's utility cannot be far below her proportional share)

when $w_i < w_N/n$, while a higher y yields a stronger guarantee for the agent when $w_i > w_N/n$ (note that the quantity w_N/n is the average weight of the n agents). This raises the same two questions that we posed for $\text{WEF}(x, y)$: For which pairs (x, y) can $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$ always be attained? And is it possible to attain it for different pairs (x, y) simultaneously?

To answer these questions, we first define a stronger version of $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$ which we call $\text{WPROP}^*(x, y)$.

Definition 3.5 ($\text{WPROP}^*(x, y)$). For $x, y \in [0, 1]$, an allocation (A_1, \dots, A_n) is said to satisfy $\text{WPROP}^*(x, y)$ if for any $i \in N$, the following holds: There exists $B \subseteq M \setminus A_i$ with $|B| \leq 1$ and, for every $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$, there exists $B_j \subseteq A_j$ with $|B_j| \leq 1$ such that

$$\frac{u_i(A_i) + y \cdot u_i(B)}{w_i} \geq \frac{u_i(M) - x \cdot \sum_{j \in N \setminus \{i\}} u_i(B_j)}{w_N}.$$

Since $\sum_{j \in N \setminus \{i\}} u_i(B_j) \leq (n-1) \cdot u_i(B) \leq n \cdot u_i(B)$, where we take B to be the singleton set containing i 's most valuable item in $M \setminus A_i$ if $A_i \neq M$ and the empty set otherwise, $\text{WPROP}^*(x, y)$ is a strengthening of $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$. Nevertheless, it is less intuitive than $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$. As such, we do not propose $\text{WPROP}^*(x, y)$ as a major fairness desideratum in its own right, but it will prove to be a useful concept in establishing some of our results.

We first show that for all x and y , $\text{WEF}(x, y)$ implies $\text{WPROP}^*(x, y)$, which in turn implies $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$; this generalizes the fact that weighted envy-freeness implies weighted proportionality, which corresponds to taking $x = y = 0$. Note that while we generally think of x and y as being constants not depending on n or w_1, \dots, w_n , in the following three implications we will derive more refined bounds in which x and y may depend on these parameters.

Lemma 3.6. For any $x, y \in [0, 1]$ and $y' \geq (1 - \frac{\min_{i \in N} w_i}{w_N})y$, $\text{WEF}(x, y)$ implies $\text{WPROP}^*(x, y')$.

In particular, $\text{WEF}(x, y)$ implies $\text{WPROP}^*(x, y)$.

Lemma 3.7. For any $x, y \in [0, 1]$ and $x' \geq (1 - \frac{1}{n})x$, $\text{WPROP}^*(x, y)$ implies $\text{WPROP}(x', y)$.

In particular, $\text{WPROP}^*(x, y)$ implies $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$.

Corollary 3.8. For any $x, y \in [0, 1]$, $\text{WEF}(x, y)$ implies $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$.

Combining Corollary 3.8 and Theorem 3.3, we find that $\text{WPROP}(x, 1-x)$ can be guaranteed for any fixed x . Can it be guaranteed for two different x simultaneously? Can it be guaranteed for x, y such that $x + y < 1$? The following theorem (along with the discussion after it) shows that the answer to both questions is no.

Theorem 3.9. For any $x, x', y, y' \in [0, 1]$, if $x' + y < 1$ or $x + y' < 1$, there is an instance with identical items in which no allocation is both $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$ and $\text{WPROP}(x', y')$.

Proof. We handle the case $x' + y < 1$; the case $x + y' < 1$ is analogous. Consider an instance with m identical items. The entitlements are $w_1 = \dots = w_{n-1} = \varepsilon$ and $w_n = 1 - (n-1)\varepsilon$ for some small $\varepsilon > 0$. We will choose m, n, ε so that $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$ requires giving at least 1 item to each of the first $n-1$ agents, while $\text{WPROP}(x', y')$ requires giving

at least $m - n + 2$ items to the last agent. Since there are only m items, this allows us to conclude that no allocation is both $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$ and $\text{WPROP}(x', y')$.

By definition of $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$ and $\text{WPROP}(x', y')$, it suffices to choose m, n, ε satisfying these two inequalities:

$$(*) \quad \varepsilon m - \varepsilon n x - y > 0;$$

$$(**) \quad (1 - (n-1)\varepsilon)(m - n x') - y' > m - n + 1.$$

Inequality $(*)$ can be rearranged to $\varepsilon m > \varepsilon n x + y$. Inequality $(**)$, upon dividing by $n-1$ and rearranging, becomes

$$\varepsilon m < 1 + \varepsilon n x' - \frac{y' + x' n}{n-1}.$$

Hence, as long as the gap between the quantities on the right-hand sides of the two rearranged inequalities is greater than ε , there exists an m satisfying both inequalities. So it is sufficient to find n, ε such that

$$(\varepsilon n x + y) + \varepsilon < 1 + \varepsilon n x' - \frac{y' + x' n}{n-1}.$$

Rearranging, this becomes

$$\varepsilon \cdot (n x + 1 - n x') < 1 - y - \frac{y' + x' n}{n-1}.$$

The limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ of the right-hand side is $1 - y - x'$, which is positive by assumption. Choose n large enough so that the right-hand side is positive. Then, choose ε small enough so that the left-hand side is smaller than the right-hand side, and therefore the inequality holds. \square

Theorem 3.9 has several corollaries.

First, taking $y = 1 - x$ and $y' = 1 - x'$ yields that, if $x \neq x'$, there is an instance in which no allocation is both $\text{WPROP}(x, 1-x)$ and $\text{WPROP}(x', 1-x')$. Combining this with Corollary 3.8 gives the same incompatibility for $\text{WEF}(x, 1-x)$ and $\text{WEF}(x', 1-x')$.

Second, taking $x' = x$ and $y' = y$ yields that, when $x + y < 1$, a $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$ allocation is not guaranteed to exist, and therefore a $\text{WEF}(x, y)$ allocation may not exist.

Third, we can generalize Chakraborty et al. (2020)'s result that $\text{WEF}(1, 0)$ does not imply $\text{WPROP}(0, 1)$:

Corollary 3.10. For any distinct $x, x' \in [0, 1]$, $\text{WEF}(x, 1-x)$ does not imply $\text{WPROP}(x', 1-x')$.

Proof. Assume for contradiction that $\text{WEF}(x, 1-x)$ implies $\text{WPROP}(x', 1-x')$ for some $x \neq x'$. By Theorem 3.2, a $\text{WEF}(x, 1-x)$ allocation always exists, and therefore such an allocation is $\text{WPROP}(x', 1-x')$. By Corollary 3.8, this allocation is also $\text{WPROP}(x, 1-x)$. Hence, an allocation that is both $\text{WPROP}(x, 1-x)$ and $\text{WPROP}(x', 1-x')$ always exists, contradicting the first corollary of Theorem 3.9 mentioned above. \square

3.3 Weighted Nash welfare

The WEF and WPROP criteria consider individual agents or pairs of agents. A different approach, known in economics as ‘‘welfarism’’ (Moulin 2003), takes a global view and tries to find an allocation that maximizes a certain aggregate function of the utilities. A common aggregate function is the product of utilities, also called the *Nash welfare*. This notion extends to the weighted setting as follows.

Definition 3.11 (MWNW). A *maximum weighted Nash welfare* allocation is an allocation that maximizes the weighted product $\prod_{i \in N} u_i(A_i)^{w_i}$.⁴

With equal entitlements, MWNW implies EF1 (Caraianis et al. 2019). However, with different entitlements, MWNW is incompatible with WEF(1, 0) (Chakraborty et al. 2020) and with WPROP(0, 1) (Chakraborty, Schmidt-Kraepelin, and Suksompong 2021). We generalize both of these incompatibility results at once.

Theorem 3.12. *For each $x \in [0, 1]$, there exists an instance with identical items in which every MWNW allocation is not WPROP($x, 1 - x$), and hence not WEF($x, 1 - x$).*

4 Share-Based Notions

In this section, we turn our attention to share-based notions, which assign a threshold to each agent representing the agent’s “fair share”. Denote by $\Pi(M, n)$ the collection of all ordered partitions of M into n subsets. In the equal-entitlement setting, the (*1-out-of- n*) *maximin share* of an agent i is defined as follows:

$$\text{MMS}_i^{1\text{-out-of-}n}(M) := \max_{(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \in \Pi(M, n)} \min_{j \in [n]} u_i(Z_j).$$

Sometimes we drop M and the superscript ‘1-out-of- n ’ and simply write MMS_i . An allocation is called *MMS-fair* or simply *MMS* if the utility that each agent receives is at least as high as the agent’s MMS. Similarly, for a parameter α , an allocation is called α -*MMS-fair* or α -*MMS* if every agent receives utility at least α times her MMS. We will use analogous terminology for other share-based notions.

There are several ways to extend this notion to the unequal-entitlement setting. The first definition is due to Farhadi et al. (2019). Denote by $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$ the vector of weights.

Definition 4.1 (WMMS). The *weighted maximin share* of an agent $i \in N$ is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{WMMS}_i^{\mathbf{w}}(M) &:= \max_{(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \in \Pi(M, n)} \min_{j \in [n]} \frac{w_i}{w_j} \cdot u_i(Z_j) \\ &= w_i \cdot \max_{(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \in \Pi(M, n)} \min_{j \in [n]} \frac{u_i(Z_j)}{w_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Sometimes we will drop \mathbf{w} and M from the notation when these are clear from the context; the same convention applies to other notions.

Intuitively, WMMS tries to find the most proportional allocation with respect to all agents’ weights and agent i ’s utility function. Note that the WMMS of agent i depends not only on i ’s entitlement, but also on the entitlements of all other agents. In particular, even if i ’s entitlement remains fixed, her WMMS might vary due to changes in the other weights. This can be seen as a disadvantage of the WMMS

⁴If the maximum weighted product is zero (that is, when all allocations give a utility of zero to one or more agents), then the MWNW rule first maximizes the number of agents who get a positive utility, and subject to that, maximizes the weighted product for these agents.

notion. Farhadi et al. (2019) showed that a $1/n$ -WMMS allocation always exists, and this guarantee is tight for every n .

The second definition was implicitly considered by Babaioff, Nisan, and Talgam-Cohen (2021), who did not give it a name. Following Segal-Halevi (2019), we call it the *ordinal maximin share*. Babaioff, Ezra, and Feige (2021) called it the *pessimistic share*. To define this share, we first extend the notion of 1-out-of- n MMS as follows. For any positive integers $\ell \leq d$,

$$\text{MMS}_i^{\ell\text{-out-of-}d}(M) := \max_{P \in \Pi(M, d)} \min_{Z \in \text{Unions}(P, \ell)} u_i(Z),$$

where the minimum is taken over all unions of ℓ bundles from a given d -partition P . Based on this generalized MMS notion, we define the ordinal MMS:

Definition 4.2 (OMMS). The *ordinal maximin share* of an agent $i \in N$ is defined as:

$$\text{OMMS}_i^{\mathbf{w}}(M) := \max_{\ell, d: \frac{\ell}{d} \leq \frac{w_i}{w_N}} \text{MMS}_i^{\ell\text{-out-of-}d}(M).$$

With equal entitlements, the OMMS is equal to the MMS. Therefore, an OMMS allocation always exists for agents with identical valuations, but may not exist for $n \geq 3$ agents with different valuations (Kurokawa, Procaccia, and Wang 2018). With different entitlements, it is an open question whether an OMMS allocation always exists for agents with identical valuations.

The third notion, the *AnyPrice Share*, is due to Babaioff, Ezra, and Feige (2021). Instead of partitioning the items into n disjoint bundles, an agent is allowed to choose any collection of (possibly overlapping) bundles. However, the agent must then assign a weight to each chosen bundle so that the sum of the bundles’ weights is w_N , and each item belongs to bundles whose total weight is at most the agent’s entitlement. The AnyPrice Share is the agent’s utility for the least valuable chosen bundle. Formally:

Definition 4.3 (APS). The *AnyPrice share* of an agent $i \in N$ is defined as:

$$\text{APS}_i^{\mathbf{w}}(M) := \max_{P \in \text{AllowedBundleCollections}(M, w_i)} \min_{Z \in P} u_i(Z).$$

where the maximum is taken over all collections P of bundles such that for some assignment of weights to the bundles in P , the total weight of all bundles in P is w_N , and for each item, the total weight of the bundles to which the item belongs is at most w_i .

Observe that when all entitlements are equal (to w_N/n), the agent can choose any 1-out-of- n MMS partition and assign a weight of w_N/n to each part; this shows that the APS is at least the MMS in the equal-entitlement setting. Babaioff, Ezra, and Feige (2021) proved that a $3/5$ -APS allocation exists for agents with arbitrary entitlements, and that the APS is always at least as large as the OMMS. Hence, their result implies the existence of a $3/5$ -OMMS allocation. Babaioff et al. also gave an equal-entitlement example in which the APS is strictly larger than the MMS. Their example shows a disadvantage of the APS: an allocation that gives

every agent her APS may not exist even when all agents have identical valuations and equal entitlements.

The fourth notion, which is new to this paper, is the *normalized maximin share*. The idea is that we take an agent’s 1-out-of- n MMS and scale it according to the agent’s entitlement.

Definition 4.4 (NMMS). The *normalized maximin share* of an agent $i \in N$ is defined as:

$$\text{NMMS}_i^w(M) := \frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot n \cdot \text{MMS}_i^{1\text{-out-of-}n}(M).$$

Compared to the previous three notions, the definition of NMMS is rather simple. Moreover, unlike WMMS, the NMMS of an agent depends only on the agent’s relative entitlement (i.e., w_i/w_N).

APS-fairness and OMMS-fairness are both “ordinal” notions in the sense that, even though the APS and OMMS values are numerical, whether an allocation is APS- or OMMS-fair can be determined by only inspecting each agent’s ordinal ranking over bundles. On the other hand, WMMS-fairness and NMMS-fairness are both “cardinal” notions, since they depend crucially on the numerical utilities. We show that there are no implication relations between ordinal and cardinal notions: each type of notions does not imply any nontrivial approximation of the other type.

Theorem 4.5. (a) *An APS-fair or OMMS-fair allocation does not necessarily yield any positive approximation of WMMS-fairness or NMMS-fairness.*

(b) *A WMMS-fair or NMMS-fair allocation does not necessarily yield any positive approximation of APS-fairness or OMMS-fairness.*

Proof. For both parts we consider agents who share the same utility function. Since an agent’s APS is always at least as large as her OMMS (Babaioff, Ezra, and Feige 2021), it suffices to consider APS for part (a) and OMMS for part (b).

(a) There are two items with utilities 40 and 60, and the weights are $w_1 = 0.4$ and $w_2 = 0.6$. Agent 1’s APS is 0, since for any assignment of weights to bundles, each item must have a total weight of at most 0.4, so the empty bundle must have a weight of at least 0.2. Hence, the allocation giving both items to agent 2 is APS-fair; this leaves agent 1 with utility 0. On the other hand, agent 1’s WMMS is 40. Moreover, the MMS is 40, so agent 1’s NMMS is $0.4 \cdot 2 \cdot 40 = 32$. Therefore, the above APS-fair allocation does not yield any positive approximation of the NMMS or WMMS for agent 1.

(b) Consider the same items as above, but now there are three agents with weights $w_1 = w_2 = 0.2$ and $w_3 = 0.6$. The WMMS and NMMS are always 0 when $n > m$, so every allocation is WMMS-fair and NMMS-fair. However, taking $(\ell, d) = (1, 2)$ in the definition of OMMS, we find that agent 3’s OMMS is at least 40. Therefore, a WMMS-fair and NMMS-fair allocation guarantees no positive fraction of the OMMS. \square

Given that NMMS is a new notion, an important question is whether any useful approximation of it can be ensured. Farhadi et al. (2019) proved that the best possible WMMS

guarantee is $1/n$ -WMMS. We show that the same holds for NMMS, starting with the upper bound. The proofs can be found in Appendix B.

Theorem 4.6. *For each n , there is no NMMS guarantee over all instances with n agents better than $1/n$ -NMMS.*

We establish a matching lower bound by showing that $\text{WPROP}^*(1, 0)$, and hence $\text{WEF}(1, 0)$, implies $1/n$ -NMMS.

Lemma 4.7. *$\text{WPROP}^*(1, 0)$ implies $1/n$ -NMMS.*

Proof. Choose an arbitrary agent $i \in N$, and let B_i^* be the set of the $n - 1$ most valuable items for i , ties broken arbitrarily. In any partition of M into n bundles, at least one bundle does not contain any item from the set B_i^* , and thus it is contained in $M \setminus B_i^*$. This means that

$$\text{MMS}_i \leq u_i(M \setminus B_i^*). \quad (1)$$

In any $\text{WPROP}^*(1, 0)$ allocation A , there exists $B_j \subseteq A_j$ of size at most 1 for each $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(A_i) &\geq \frac{w_i}{w_N} \left(u_i(M) - \sum_{j \in N \setminus \{i\}} u_i(B_j) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{w_i}{w_N} (u_i(M) - u_i(B_i^*)) \\ &\geq \frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot \text{MMS}_i && \text{(by (1))} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \cdot \text{NMMS}_i, \end{aligned}$$

so the allocation A is $1/n$ -NMMS, as desired. \square

Theorem 4.8. *$\text{WEF}(1, 0)$ implies $1/n$ -NMMS. In particular, every instance admits a $1/n$ -NMMS allocation. The factor $1/n$ in both statements cannot be improved.*

Theorem 4.8 is an immediate consequence of Lemmas 3.6 and 4.7 and Theorem 4.6. It generalizes the result that EF1 implies $1/n$ -MMS in the unweighted setting (Amanatidis, Birmpas, and Markakis 2018, Prop. 3.6), and stands in contrast to a result of Chakraborty et al. (2020, Prop. 6.2) that $\text{WEF}(1, 0)$ does not imply any positive approximation of WMMS. Since a weighted round-robin algorithm as well as a generalization of Barman, Krishnamurthy, and Vaish (2018)’s market-based algorithm ensure $\text{WEF}(1, 0)$ (Chakraborty et al. 2020), these algorithms guarantee $1/n$ -NMMS as well. Moreover, we show that if each agent values each item at most her NMMS, then the approximation factor can be improved to $1/2$, thereby providing a direct analog to a WMMS result by Farhadi et al. (2019, Thm. 3.2).

Theorem 4.9. *Given an instance, if $u_i(g) \leq \text{NMMS}_i$ for all $i \in N$ and $g \in M$, then there exists a $1/2$ -NMMS allocation.*

Unlike $\text{WEF}(1, 0)$, we show that for each $x \in [0, 1)$, $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ does not imply any positive approximation of NMMS, so the same holds for $\text{WPROP}(x, 1 - x)$. In addition, the same holds even for $\text{WPROP}(1, 0)$, which explains why using $\text{WPROP}^*(1, 0)$ is necessary in Lemma 4.7. Further, MWNW does not imply any positive approximation of

NMMS, thereby providing evidence that $1/n$ -NMMS is not trivial to achieve. This also contrasts with the unweighted setting, where maximum Nash welfare implies $\Theta(1/\sqrt{n})$ -MMS (Caragiannis et al. 2019). The proofs for all of these results can be found in Appendix B.1.

Farhadi et al. (2019, Thm. 2.2) established the $1/n$ -WMMS guarantee through a well-known algorithm, the (*unweighted*) *round-robin algorithm*, which simply lets agents take turns picking their favorite item from the remaining items. A crucial specification required for their guarantee to work is that the agents must take turns in non-increasing order of their weights. This motivates the following definition:

Definition 4.10 (OEF1). An allocation is *ordered-EF1* if

- (i) it is EF1 when we disregard weights, and
- (ii) the agents can be renumbered so that $w_1 \geq w_2 \geq \dots \geq w_n$ and no agent $i \in N$ has (unweighted) envy towards any later agent $j \in \{i + 1, i + 2, \dots, n\}$.

The standard proof that the unweighted round-robin algorithm outputs an EF1 allocation⁵ implies that the algorithm with the aforementioned ordering specification outputs an OEF1 allocation. Moreover, it follows from Farhadi et al. (2019)’s proof that OEF1 implies $1/n$ -WMMS. We show next that, interestingly, OEF1 also implies $1/n$ -NMMS, which means that the same algorithm guarantees the optimal approximation of both WMMS and NMMS.

Theorem 4.11. *Any OEF1 allocation is also $1/n$ -NMMS.*

WMMS and NMMS are both cardinal extensions of MMS to the weighted setting. However, we show in the next two theorems that the relationship between them is rather weak.

Theorem 4.12. *WMMS implies $1/n$ -NMMS, and the factor $1/n$ is tight.*⁶

Theorem 4.13. *For $n \geq 3$, NMMS does not imply any positive approximation of WMMS.*

Chakraborty et al. (2020) showed that $\text{WEF}(1, 0)$ does not guarantee any positive approximation of WMMS. In Appendix B.1, we prove a similar negative result for $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ and $\text{WPROP}(x, 1 - x)$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$.

5 Identical Items: Lower and Upper Quota

We have seen many fairness notions and proved that several of them are incompatible with one another. In this section, we add another dimension to the comparison between fairness notions by focusing on the case where all items are identical. The motivation for studying this case is twofold. First, due to its simplicity, it is easier to agree on a fairness criterion. If the items were divisible, agent i should clearly receive her *quota* of $q_i := \frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot m$ items. With indivisible items, one may therefore expect agent i to receive either her *lower quota* $\lfloor q_i \rfloor$ or her *upper quota* $\lceil q_i \rceil$. Second, the case of identical items is practically relevant when allocating parliament seats among states or parties, a setting commonly

⁵See, e.g., (Caragiannis et al. 2019, p. 7).

⁶Note that the tightness does not follow from Theorem 4.6, since a WMMS allocation does not always exist.

known as *apportionment* (Balinski and Young 1975, 2001). Both quotas are frequently considered in apportionment.

We determine whether each fairness notion implies lower quota (resp., upper quota) in the identical-item setting, i.e., whether it ensures that each agent $i \in N$ receives at least $\lfloor q_i \rfloor$ items (resp., at most $\lceil q_i \rceil$ items). Our results are summarized in Table 1; all proofs are in Appendix C.

Notion	Lower quota	Upper quota
$\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$	Yes if $x = 0$ No if $x \in (0, 1]$	Yes if $x = 1$ No if $x \in [0, 1)$
$\text{WPROP}(x, 1 - x)$	No	No
MWNW	No	No
WMMS	No	No
NMMS	No	No
OMMS	Yes	No
APS	Yes	No

Table 1: Summary of whether each fairness notion implies lower or upper quota in the identical-item setting.

To illustrate the ideas behind some of these proofs, consider an instance with $n = m = 3$ and entitlements 4, 1, 1. The quotas are 2, 0.5, 0.5. We denote an allocation by (a_1, \dots, a_n) , where $a_i = |A_i|$ = the number of items that agent i receives.

The unique allocation satisfying $\text{WEF}(1, 0)$ is $(1, 1, 1)$: any agent that gets no item would have weighted envy towards any agent that gets two or more items, even after removing a single item. Note that $(1, 1, 1)$ is also the unique MWNW allocation as well as the unique allocation satisfying WMMS- and NMMS-fairness, since the WMMS and NMMS are positive for all agents. However, this allocation violates the lower quota of agent 1, which is 2 items.

In contrast, the unique allocation satisfying $\text{WEF}(0, 1)$ is $(3, 0, 0)$: if agent 1 gets two or fewer items, she feels weighted envy—even after getting an additional item—towards another agent who gets (at least) one item. The allocation $(3, 0, 0)$ also satisfies OMMS- and APS-fairness, as the OMMS and APS of agents 2 and 3 are both 0. However, it violates the upper quota of agent 1.

No notion that we have seen so far guarantees both lower and upper quotas. In light of this, we introduce a new rule based on the well-known *leximin* principle (Moulin 2003). With equal entitlements, leximin aims to maximize the smallest utility, then the second smallest utility, and so on. To extend it to the setting with different entitlements, we have to carefully consider how the utilities should be normalized. A first idea is to normalize the agents’ utilities by their proportional share, that is:

$$\arg \max_{(A_1, \dots, A_n)} \text{leximin}_{i \in N} \frac{w_N \cdot u_i(A_i)}{w_i \cdot u_i(M)}$$

where “leximin” means that we maximize the smallest value, then the second smallest, and so on. However, this rule yields a blatantly unfair outcome when there is a single

item and two agents: since the smallest utility is always 0, the item is allocated to the agent with a *smaller* entitlement, as this makes the ratio w_N/w_i larger. Therefore, we instead maximize the minimum *difference* between the agents’ normalized utilities and their proportional shares.

Definition 5.1 (WEG). A *weighted egalitarian* allocation is an allocation in

$$\arg \max_{(A_1, \dots, A_n)} \operatorname{leximin}_{i \in N} \left(\frac{u_i(A_i)}{u_i(M)} - \frac{w_i}{w_N} \right).$$

This rule is similar to the “Leximin rule” for apportionment (Biró, Kóczy, and Sziklai 2015); the latter rule minimizes the leximin vector of the *departures*, defined as the absolute difference $\left| \frac{w_i \cdot u_i(M)}{w_N \cdot u_i(A_i)} - 1 \right|$.

Note that in the instance with one item and two agents, a WEG allocation gives the item to the agent with a larger entitlement, as one would reasonably expect. Moreover, in the aforementioned example with $n = m = 3$, the WEG allocations are $(2, 1, 0)$ and $(2, 0, 1)$, which satisfy both quotas. The next theorem shows that this holds in general.

Theorem 5.2. *With identical items, every WEG allocation satisfies both lower and upper quota.*

In contrast to share-based notions, a WEG allocation always exists by definition. Moreover, it is relatively easy to explain such an allocation. For example, if a WEG allocation in a particular instance yields a minimum difference $\frac{u_i(A_i)}{u_i(M)} - \frac{w_i}{w_N} = -0.05$, one can explain to the agents that “each of you receives only 5% less than your proportional share, and there is no allocation with a smaller deviation”. This makes the egalitarian approach attractive for further study in the context of unequal entitlements.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we have revisited known fairness notions for the setting where agents can have different entitlements to the resource, and introduced several new notions for this setting. Our work further reveals the richness of weighted fair division that has been uncovered by several recent papers. Indeed, when all agents have the same weight, $\operatorname{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ reduces to EF1 and $\operatorname{WPROP}(x, 1 - x)$ reduces to PROP1 for all $x \in [0, 1]$, while WMMS, NMMS, and OMMS all reduce to MMS. We believe that the concepts we introduced add meaningful value beyond those proposed in prior work. In particular, the notions $\operatorname{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ and $\operatorname{WPROP}(x, 1 - x)$ allow us to choose the degree to which we want to prioritize agents with larger weights in comparison to those with smaller weights. A natural middle ground is $x = 1/2$ —the notion $\operatorname{WEF}(1/2, 1/2)$ is particularly appealing because Webster’s apportionment method, which satisfies it (Theorem 3.3), is known to be the unique unbiased method under various definitions of bias in the apportionment context (Balinski and Young 2001, Sec. A.5). Furthermore, our NMMS notion provides an intuitive generalization of the well-studied MMS criterion for which a nontrivial approximation can always be attained.

An interesting direction for future work is to study our new fairness notions in conjunction with other properties,

for example the economic efficiency property of *Pareto optimality* (PO). Chakraborty et al. (2020) have shown, by means of generalizing Barman, Krisnamurthy, and Vaish (2018)’s market-based algorithm, that $\operatorname{WEF}(1, 0)$ is compatible with PO, but it remains unclear whether their argument can be further generalized to work for $\operatorname{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ when $x < 1$. Extending some of our results to non-additive utilities is a challenging but important direction as well.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the Israel Science Foundation under grant number 712/20 and by an NUS Start-up Grant. We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments.

References

- Aleksandrov, M.; Aziz, H.; Gaspers, S.; and Walsh, T. 2015. Online fair division: Analysing a food bank problem. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, 2540–2546.
- Amanatidis, G.; Birmpas, G.; and Markakis, E. 2018. Comparing approximate relaxations of envy-freeness. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, 42–48.
- Aziz, H.; Moulin, H.; and Sandmirskiy, F. 2020. A polynomial-time algorithm for computing a Pareto optimal and almost proportional allocation. *Operations Research Letters*, 48(5): 573–578.
- Babaioff, M.; Ezra, T.; and Feige, U. 2021. Fair-share allocations for agents with arbitrary entitlements. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, 127.
- Babaioff, M.; Nisan, N.; and Talgam-Cohen, I. 2021. Competitive equilibrium with indivisible goods and generic budgets. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 46(1): 382–403.
- Balinski, M. L.; and Young, H. P. 1975. The quota method of apportionment. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 82(7): 701–730.
- Balinski, M. L.; and Young, H. P. 2001. *Fair Representation: Meeting the Ideal of One Man, One Vote*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Barman, S.; Krisnamurthy, S. K.; and Vaish, R. 2018. Finding fair and efficient allocations. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, 557–574.
- Biró, P.; Kóczy, L. Á.; and Sziklai, B. 2015. Fair apportionment in the view of the Venice Commission’s recommendation. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 77: 32–41.
- Budish, E. 2011. The combinatorial assignment problem: Approximate competitive equilibrium from equal incomes. *Journal of Political Economy*, 119(6): 1061–1103.
- Caragiannis, I.; Kurokawa, D.; Moulin, H.; Procaccia, A. D.; Shah, N.; and Wang, J. 2019. The unreasonable fairness of maximum Nash welfare. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation*, 7(3): 12:1–12:32.

- Chakraborty, M.; Igarashi, A.; Suksompong, W.; and Zick, Y. 2020. Weighted envy-freeness in indivisible item allocation. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS)*, 231–239.
- Chakraborty, M.; Schmidt-Kraepelin, U.; and Suksompong, W. 2021. Picking sequences and monotonicity in weighted fair division. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, 82–88.
- Conitzer, V.; Freeman, R.; and Shah, N. 2017. Fair public decision making. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, 629–646.
- Farhadi, A.; Ghodsi, M.; Hajiaghayi, M.; Lahaie, S.; Pennock, D.; Seddighin, M.; Seddighin, S.; and Yami, H. 2019. Fair allocation of indivisible goods to asymmetric agents. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 64: 1–20.
- Garg, J.; and Taki, S. 2021. An improved approximation algorithm for maximin shares. *Artificial Intelligence*, 300: 103547.
- Ghodsi, M.; Hajiaghayi, M. T.; Seddighin, M.; Seddighin, S.; and Yami, H. 2018. Fair allocation of indivisible goods: Improvements and generalizations. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, 539–556.
- Goldman, J.; and Procaccia, A. D. 2014. Spliddit: Unleashing fair division algorithms. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges*, 13(2): 41–46.
- Kurokawa, D.; Procaccia, A. D.; and Wang, J. 2018. Fair enough: Guaranteeing approximate maximin shares. *Journal of the ACM*, 64(2): 8:1–8:27.
- Lipton, R. J.; Markakis, E.; Mossel, E.; and Saberi, A. 2004. On approximately fair allocations of indivisible goods. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, 125–131.
- Moulin, H. 2003. *Fair Division and Collective Welfare*. MIT Press.
- Pathak, P. A.; Sönmez, T.; Ünver, M. U.; and Yenmez, M. B. 2021. Fair allocation of vaccines, ventilators and antiviral treatments: Leaving no ethical value behind in health care rationing. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, 785–786.
- Segal-Halevi, E. 2019. The maximin share dominance relation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.08763*.

A Omitted Proofs — Section 3 — Fairness up to one item

A.1 The WWEF1 condition

Chakraborty et al. (2020) defined the WWEF1 condition as follows: for each pair i, j of agents, i does not envy j after either (i) at most one item is removed from A_j , or (ii) at most one item from A_j is copied over to A_i .

The following two theorems show that, for any $x \in [0, 1]$, WWEF1 is a strictly weaker condition than $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$.

Theorem A.1. *WWEF1 is equivalent to the following condition: for every two agents i, j , there exists some $x_{i,j}$ such that the condition for $\text{WEF}(x_{i,j}, 1 - x_{i,j})$ is satisfied for that pair.*

Proof. One direction is obvious: in a WWEF1 allocation, by definition, for every pair i, j , the allocation is either $\text{WEF}(1, 0)$ or $\text{WEF}(0, 1)$, so it satisfies the condition for some $x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$.

For the other direction, recall that $\text{WEF}(x_{i,j}, 1 - x_{i,j})$ means that, for some $B \subseteq A_j$ with $|B| \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{u_i(A_j)}{w_j} - \frac{u_i(A_i)}{w_i} &\leq \left(\frac{1 - x_{i,j}}{w_i} + \frac{x_{i,j}}{w_j} \right) \cdot u_i(B) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{w_i} + x_{i,j} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{w_j} - \frac{1}{w_i} \right) \right) \cdot u_i(B). \end{aligned}$$

If $w_i > w_j$, then the same inequality holds if we replace $x_{i,j}$ with 1; otherwise, the same inequality holds if we replace $x_{i,j}$ with 0. \square

Theorem A.1 shows that, for all $x \in [0, 1]$, $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ implies WWEF1: the former fixes the same x for all pairs of agents, while the latter allows a different x for each pair of agents. The following theorem shows that the implication is strict:

Theorem A.2. *For each $x \in [0, 1]$, WWEF1 does not imply $\text{WPROP}(x, 1 - x)$; hence, it also does not imply $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$.*

Proof. Chakraborty et al. (2020) proved that MWNW implies WWEF1. However, in Theorem 3.12 we show that MWNW does not imply $\text{WPROP}(x, 1 - x)$ for any $x \in [0, 1]$. \square

A.2 Picking sequences

Theorem (3.2). *Let $x \in [0, 1]$. A picking sequence π satisfies $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ if and only if for every prefix P of π and every pair of agents i, j , where agent i has t_i picks in P and agent j has t_j picks in P , we have $t_i + (1 - x) \geq \frac{w_i}{w_j} \cdot (t_j - x)$.*

Proof. Our proof follows the template laid out by Chakraborty et al. (2020, Thm. 3.3). For notational convenience, let $y := 1 - x$.

(\Rightarrow) Assume that π fulfills $\text{WEF}(x, y)$. In particular, for every integer $k \geq 1$, $\text{WEF}(x, y)$ is satisfied in an instance where every agent has utility 1 for some k items and 0 for the remaining $m - k$ items. The k valuable items are picked in the first k turns, so if we define t_i and t_j based on this prefix, agent i has utility t_i for bundle A_i and utility t_j for bundle A_j . If $t_j = 0$ then the claim trivially holds. Otherwise, the most valuable item g in A_j has a value of 1, so by definition of $\text{WEF}(x, y)$,

$$\frac{t_i + y}{w_i} = \frac{u_i(A_i) + y \cdot u_i(g)}{w_i} \geq \frac{u_i(A_j) - x \cdot u_i(g)}{w_j} = \frac{t_j - x}{w_j}.$$

It follows that $t_i + y \geq \frac{w_i}{w_j} (t_j - x)$.

(\Leftarrow) Consider any pair of agents i, j . It suffices to show that the $\text{WEF}(x, y)$ condition for agent i towards agent j is fulfilled after every pick by agent j . Consider any pick by agent j —suppose it is the agent’s t_j -th pick. We divide the sequence of picks up to this pick into *phases*, where each phase $\ell \in [t_j]$ consists of the picks after agent j ’s $(\ell - 1)$ st pick up to (and including) the agent’s ℓ -th pick. We denote:

- $\tau_\ell :=$ the number of times agent i picks in phase ℓ (that is, between agent j ’s $(\ell - 1)$ st and ℓ -th picks).
- $\alpha_1^\ell, \alpha_2^\ell, \dots, \alpha_{\tau_\ell}^\ell :=$ agent i ’s utilities for the items that she picks herself in phase ℓ (if any);
- $\alpha_\ell := \alpha_1^\ell + \dots + \alpha_{\tau_\ell}^\ell =$ the total utility gained by agent i in phase ℓ ;
- $\beta_\ell :=$ agent i ’s utility for the item that agent j picks at the end of phase ℓ .

Let $\rho := w_i/w_j$. For any integer $s \in [t_j]$, applying the condition in the theorem statement to the picking sequence up to and including phase s , we have

$$y + \sum_{\ell=1}^s \tau_\ell \geq \rho(s - x) \quad \forall s \in [t_j]. \quad (2)$$

Every time agent i picks, she picks an item with the highest utility for her among the available items. In particular, in each phase ℓ , she picks τ_ℓ items each of which yields at least as high utility to her as each item not yet picked by agent j . This implies

$$\alpha_\ell \geq \tau_\ell \cdot \max_{\ell \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r \quad \forall \ell \in [t_j]. \quad (3)$$

Note that (3) holds trivially if $\tau_\ell = 0$ since both sides are zero.

To prove the theorem, we prove the following auxiliary claim for all $s \in [t_j]$:

$$y \cdot \max_{1 \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r + \sum_{\ell=1}^s \alpha_\ell \geq \rho \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^s \beta_\ell - x\beta_1 \right) + \left(y + \sum_{\ell=1}^s \tau_\ell - \rho(s - x) \right) \max_{s \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r. \quad (4)$$

To prove (4), we use induction on s . For the base case $s = 1$, apply (3) with $\ell = 1$, adding the term $y \cdot \max_{1 \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r$ to both sides:

$$\begin{aligned} y \cdot \max_{1 \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r + \alpha_1 &\geq (y + \tau_1) \cdot \max_{1 \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r \\ &\geq \rho y \beta_1 + (y + \tau_1 - \rho y) \cdot \max_{1 \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r \\ &= \rho(1 - x)\beta_1 + (y + \tau_1 - \rho(1 - x)) \cdot \max_{1 \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r. \end{aligned}$$

For the inductive step, assume that (4) holds for some $s - 1 \geq 1$; we will prove it for s . Using the inductive hypothesis for the first inequality below, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &y \cdot \max_{1 \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r + \sum_{\ell=1}^s \alpha_\ell \\ &= y \cdot \max_{1 \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r + \sum_{\ell=1}^{s-1} \alpha_\ell + \alpha_s \\ &\geq \rho \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{s-1} \beta_\ell - x\beta_1 \right) + \left(y + \sum_{\ell=1}^{s-1} \tau_\ell - \rho(s - 1 - x) \right) \cdot \max_{s-1 \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r + \alpha_s \\ &\stackrel{(3)}{\geq} \rho \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{s-1} \beta_\ell - x\beta_1 \right) + \left(y + \sum_{\ell=1}^{s-1} \tau_\ell - \rho(s - 1 - x) \right) \cdot \max_{s-1 \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r + \tau_s \max_{s \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \rho \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{s-1} \beta_\ell - x\beta_1 \right) + \left(y + \sum_{\ell=1}^{s-1} \tau_\ell - \rho(s-1-x) \right) \cdot \max_{s \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r + \tau_s \max_{s \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r \quad (*) \\
&= \rho \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{s-1} \beta_\ell - x\beta_1 \right) + \left(y + \sum_{\ell=1}^s \tau_\ell - \rho(s-1-x) \right) \cdot \max_{s \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r \\
&= \rho \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{s-1} \beta_\ell - x\beta_1 \right) + \rho \max_{s \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r + \left(y + \sum_{\ell=1}^s \tau_\ell - \rho(s-x) \right) \cdot \max_{s \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r \\
&\geq \rho \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{s-1} \beta_\ell - x\beta_1 \right) + \rho\beta_s + \left(y + \sum_{\ell=1}^s \tau_\ell - \rho(s-x) \right) \cdot \max_{s \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r \\
&= \rho \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^s \beta_\ell - x\beta_1 \right) + \left(y + \sum_{\ell=1}^s \tau_\ell - \rho(s-x) \right) \cdot \max_{s \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r.
\end{aligned}$$

The inequality denoted by (*) follows from the fact that, by (2), the expression in the rightmost parentheses is at least 0, and $\max_{s-1 \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r \geq \max_{s \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r$. This completes the induction and establishes (4).

Using (4) with $s = t_j$ and (2), we get that

$$y \cdot \max_{1 \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r + \sum_{\ell=1}^{t_j} \alpha_\ell \geq \rho \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{t_j} \beta_\ell - x\beta_1 \right).$$

Letting A_i and A_j be the bundles of agents i and j after agent j 's t_j -th pick, and g be the item in A_j for which agent i has the highest utility (so that $u_i(g) = \max_{1 \leq r \leq t_j} \beta_r$), we have

$$y \cdot u_i(g) + u_i(A_i) \geq \frac{w_i}{w_j} \cdot (u_i(A_j) - x\beta_1) \geq \frac{w_i}{w_j} \cdot (u_i(A_j) - x \cdot u_i(g)).$$

Hence the $\text{WEF}(x, y)$ condition for agent i towards agent j is fulfilled, completing the proof. \square

Similarly to Theorem 3.2 for $\text{WEF}(x, 1-x)$, we characterize picking sequences whose output is guaranteed to satisfy $\text{WPROP}(x, 1-x)$, thereby generalizing the characterization of Chakraborty, Schmidt-Kraepelin, and Suksompong (2021, Thm. 3.3) for $\text{WPROP}(0, 1)$.

Theorem A.3. *Let $x \in [0, 1]$. A picking sequence π satisfies $\text{WPROP}(x, 1-x)$ if and only if for every prefix of π and every agent i , we have $t_i + (1-x) \geq \frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot (k - nx)$, where t_i and k denote the number of agent i 's picks in the prefix and the length of the prefix, respectively.*

Proof. Our proof proceeds in a similar way as the WPROP1 proof of Chakraborty, Schmidt-Kraepelin, and Suksompong (2021, Thm. 3.3). For notational convenience, let $y := 1-x$.

(\Rightarrow) Assume that π fulfills $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$. In particular, for every integer $k \geq 1$, $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$ holds for an instance where every agent has utility 1 for some k items and 0 for the remaining $m-k$ items. The k valuable items are picked in the first k turns, so if we define t_i based on this prefix, agent i has utility t_i for bundle A_i and k for the entire set of items. If $t_i = k$ then the claim trivially holds. Otherwise, the most valuable item g not in A_i has a value of 1, so by definition of $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$,

$$t_i + y = u_i(A_i) + y \cdot u_i(g) \geq \frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot (u_i(M) - n \cdot x \cdot u_i(g)) = \frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot (k - nx).$$

It follows that $t_i + (1-x) \geq \frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot (k - nx)$.

(\Leftarrow) Let $\rho := w_i/w_N$, and assume that in π , agent i picks t_i times. Denote by τ_0 the number of times other agents pick before agent i 's first pick, and τ_ℓ the number of times other agents pick after agent i 's

ℓ -th pick and before her $(\ell + 1)$ st pick for $1 \leq \ell \leq t_i$, where we insert a dummy empty pick for agent i at the end of the picking sequence. Let agent i 's utility for the items that other agents pick in phase ℓ be $\beta_1^\ell, \beta_2^\ell, \dots, \beta_{\tau_\ell}^\ell$, where the phases $0, 1, \dots, t_i$ are defined as in the previous sentence. Moreover, let agent i 's utility for the items that she picks be $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{t_i}$, respectively. We may assume that at least one other agent has at least one pick; otherwise the WPROP(x, y) condition holds trivially. Let B be a singleton set consisting of an item in $M \setminus A_i$ for which agent i has the highest utility. For the prefix before agent i 's first pick, the condition in the theorem statement implies that $y \geq \rho(\tau_0 - nx)$, i.e., $y + \rho nx \geq \rho\tau_0$. By definition of B , we have $u_i(B) \geq \beta_j^\ell$ for all $0 \leq \ell \leq t_i$ and $1 \leq j \leq \tau_\ell$, so $\tau_0 u_i(B) \geq \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_0} \beta_j^0$. It follows that

$$(y + \rho nx) \cdot u_i(B) = (\rho\tau_0 + (y + \rho nx - \rho\tau_0)) \cdot u_i(B) \geq \rho \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_0} \beta_j^0 + (y + \rho nx - \rho\tau_0) \max_{\substack{0 \leq \ell \leq t_i \\ 1 \leq j \leq \tau_\ell}} \beta_j^\ell. \quad (5)$$

We claim that for each $0 \leq s \leq t_i$,

$$(y + \rho nx) \cdot u_i(B) + (1 - \rho) \sum_{\ell=1}^s \alpha_\ell \geq \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^s \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_\ell} \beta_j^\ell + \left(y + \rho nx + s(1 - \rho) - \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^s \tau_\ell \right) \max_{\substack{s \leq \ell \leq t_i \\ 1 \leq j \leq \tau_\ell}} \beta_j^\ell.$$

To prove the claim, we use induction on s . The base case $s = 0$ follows immediately from (5) since the terms $(1 - \rho) \sum_{\ell=1}^s \alpha_\ell$ and $s(1 - \rho)$ vanish. For the inductive step, assume that the claim holds for some $s - 1 \geq 0$; we will prove it for s . For the prefix before agent i 's s -th pick, the condition in the theorem statement implies that $(s - 1) + y \geq \rho(s - 1 + \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} \tau_\ell - nx)$, or equivalently

$$(y + \rho nx) + (s - 1)(1 - \rho) \geq \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} \tau_\ell. \quad (6)$$

Every time agent i picks, she picks an item with the highest utility for her among the available items, which means that

$$\alpha_s \geq \beta_j^s \quad \forall j \in [\tau_s]. \quad (7)$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & (y + \rho nx) \cdot u_i(B) + (1 - \rho) \sum_{\ell=1}^s \alpha_\ell \\ &= (y + \rho nx) \cdot u_i(B) + (1 - \rho) \sum_{\ell=1}^{s-1} \alpha_\ell + (1 - \rho) \alpha_s \\ &\geq \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_\ell} \beta_j^\ell + \left(y + \rho nx + (s - 1)(1 - \rho) - \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} \tau_\ell \right) \cdot \max_{\substack{s-1 \leq \ell \leq t_i \\ 1 \leq j \leq \tau_\ell}} \beta_j^\ell + (1 - \rho) \alpha_s \\ &\geq \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_\ell} \beta_j^\ell + \left(y + \rho nx + (s - 1)(1 - \rho) - \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} \tau_\ell \right) \cdot \max_{\substack{s \leq \ell \leq t_i \\ 1 \leq j \leq \tau_\ell}} \beta_j^\ell + (1 - \rho) \alpha_s \\ &= \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_\ell} \beta_j^\ell + \left(y + \rho nx + s(1 - \rho) - \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^s \tau_\ell \right) \cdot \max_{\substack{s \leq \ell \leq t_i \\ 1 \leq j \leq \tau_\ell}} \beta_j^\ell + (\rho\tau_s - (1 - \rho)) \max_{\substack{s \leq \ell \leq t_i \\ 1 \leq j \leq \tau_\ell}} \beta_j^\ell + (1 - \rho) \alpha_s \\ &\geq \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_\ell} \beta_j^\ell + \left(y + \rho nx + s(1 - \rho) - \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^s \tau_\ell \right) \cdot \max_{\substack{s \leq \ell \leq t_i \\ 1 \leq j \leq \tau_\ell}} \beta_j^\ell + \frac{\rho\tau_s - (1 - \rho)}{\tau_s} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_s} \beta_j^s \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1-\rho}{\tau_s} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_s} \beta_j^s \\
& = \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_\ell} \beta_j^\ell + \left(y + \rho n x + s(1-\rho) - \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^s \tau_\ell \right) \cdot \max_{\substack{s \leq \ell \leq t_i \\ 1 \leq j \leq \tau_\ell}} \beta_j^\ell + \rho \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_s} \beta_j^s \\
& = \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^s \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_\ell} \beta_j^\ell + \left(y + \rho n x + s(1-\rho) - \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^s \tau_\ell \right) \cdot \max_{\substack{s \leq \ell \leq t_i \\ 1 \leq j \leq \tau_\ell}} \beta_j^\ell.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the first inequality follows from the inductive hypothesis, the second from (6) and the fact that $\max_{\substack{s-1 \leq \ell \leq t_i \\ 1 \leq j \leq \tau_\ell}} \beta_j^\ell \geq \max_{\substack{s \leq \ell \leq t_i \\ 1 \leq j \leq \tau_\ell}} \beta_j^\ell$, and the third from (7). This completes the induction and establishes the claim.

Finally, taking $s = t_i$ in the claim, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(y + \rho n x) \cdot u_i(B) + (1-\rho) \sum_{\ell=1}^{t_i} \alpha_\ell & \geq \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^{t_i} \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_\ell} \beta_j^\ell + \left(y + \rho n x + t_i(1-\rho) - \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^{t_i} \tau_\ell \right) \cdot \max_{1 \leq j \leq \tau_{t_i}} \beta_j^\ell \\
& \geq \rho \sum_{\ell=0}^{t_i} \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_\ell} \beta_j^\ell,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the condition in the theorem statement for the entire picking sequence. Adding $\rho \sum_{\ell=1}^{t_i} \alpha_\ell$ to both sides, we find that

$$(y + \rho n x) \cdot u_i(B) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{t_i} \alpha_\ell \geq \rho \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{t_i} \alpha_\ell + \sum_{\ell=0}^{t_i} \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_\ell} \beta_j^\ell \right).$$

In other words, $(y + \rho n x) \cdot u_i(B) + u_i(A_i) \geq \rho \cdot u_i(M)$. Rearranging this yields $u_i(A_i) + y \cdot u_i(B) \geq \rho \cdot (u_i(M) - n \cdot x \cdot u_i(B))$. This means that the allocation produced by π is $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$, as desired. \square

The picking sequences in Theorem 3.3 can be derived from *divisor methods*. Each divisor method gives rise to a picking sequence associated with a function $f : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $t \leq f(t) \leq t + 1$ for each t , and assigns each pick to an agent i who minimizes the ratio $f(t_i)/w_i$, where t_i denotes the number of times that agent i has picked so far. We will refer to such picking sequences as *divisor picking sequences*. We show next that if we restrict our attention to divisor picking sequences, then for each x , the picking sequence in Theorem 3.3 is the only one satisfying either $\text{WEF}(x, 1-x)$ or $\text{WPROP}(x, 1-x)$. This generalizes the recent result of Chakraborty, Schmidt-Kraepelin, and Suksompong (2021) for $\text{WEF}(1, 0)$ and $\text{WPROP}(0, 1)$.⁷

Theorem A.4. *Let $x \in [0, 1]$. A divisor picking sequence with function f satisfies $\text{WPROP}(x, 1-x)$ if and only if $f(t) = t + (1-x)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. The same holds for $\text{WEF}(x, 1-x)$.*

Proof. Let $y := 1 - x$. By Corollary 3.8 and Theorem 3.3, it suffices to prove that if a divisor picking sequence with function f satisfies $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$, then $f(t) = t + y$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. We prove this implication even for the special case in which all items are identical; in this case, $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$ implies that the number of items given to each agent i is at least $\frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot (m - nx) - y$.

We first show that

$$\frac{f(a)}{f(b)} \leq \frac{a+y}{b+y} \quad \text{for all integers } a \geq 0, b \geq 1. \quad (8)$$

⁷See Theorems 4.3 and 4.9 of their extended version: <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2104.14347.pdf>

Fix a and b , and assume for contradiction that $\frac{f(a)}{f(b)} > \frac{a+y}{b+y}$. Choose w_1 and w_2 such that $\frac{f(a)}{f(b)} > \frac{w_1}{w_2} > \frac{a+y}{b+y}$, choose n large enough so that $\frac{w_1}{w_2} > \frac{a+y}{b+y-\frac{1}{n-1}}$, and consider an instance with $a + (n-1)(b+1)$ identical items and n agents such that $w_2 = w_3 = \dots = w_n$. Since $\frac{f(a)}{w_1} > \frac{f(b)}{w_2}$, agents $2, \dots, n$ all pick their $(b+1)$ st item before agent 1 picks her $(a+1)$ st item; therefore, agent 1 gets at most a items overall. Moreover, since $\frac{w_1}{w_2} > \frac{a+y}{b+y-\frac{1}{n-1}}$, we have

$$w_1 + (a+y)(n-1)w_2 < w_1(n-1)(b+y),$$

which implies that

$$(a+y)(w_1 + (n-1)w_2) < w_1(a+y-1 + (n-1)(b+y)),$$

or equivalently

$$a < \frac{w_1}{w_1 + (n-1)w_2} \cdot (a + (n-1)(b+1) - nx) - y = \frac{w_1}{w_N} \cdot (m - nx) - y,$$

which contradicts the $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$ condition. It follows that $\frac{f(a)}{f(b)} \leq \frac{a+y}{b+y}$, as claimed in (8).

We now show that $f(t) = t + y$ for all $t \geq 1$. For any positive integer k , we can apply (8) for both (t, kt) and the inverse pair (kt, t) . This implies $\frac{f(kt)}{f(t)} = \frac{kt+y}{t+y}$, which in turn implies $f(kt) = \frac{kt+y}{t+y} \cdot f(t)$. If $f(t) > t + y$, say $f(t) = t + y + \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, then $f(kt) = kt + y + \frac{kt+y}{t+y} \cdot \varepsilon$; the latter quantity exceeds $kt + 1$ when k is sufficiently large, contradicting the definition of divisor picking sequences. The case $f(t) < t + y$ leads to a similar contradiction. This means that $f(t) = t + y$ for all $t \geq 1$.

It remains to show that $f(0) = y$. We consider two cases.

Case 1: $y > 0$. First, assume for contradiction that $f(0) = 0$. Choose n large enough so that $\frac{1+y}{ny} < 1$, and choose w_1 large enough so that $\frac{1+y}{ny} < \frac{w_1}{w_N}$. Assume that there are $m = n$ identical items. Since $f(0) = 0$, every agent gets exactly one item. On the other hand, $1 < \frac{w_1}{w_N}(n - nx) - y$. Hence, for any $B \subseteq M \setminus A_1$ with $|B| \leq 1$, it holds that

$$u_1(A_1) + y \cdot u_1(B) \leq 1 + y < \frac{w_1}{w_N} \cdot ny = \frac{w_1}{w_N} \cdot (n - nx) \leq \frac{w_1}{w_N} \cdot (u_1(M) - n \cdot x \cdot u_1(B)).$$

This shows that the divisor picking sequence fails $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$, a contradiction. Hence, $f(0) > 0$. Now, the same argument in the proof of (8) holds for any $b \geq 0$. Applying (8) for both $(0, 1)$ and $(1, 0)$ implies that $\frac{f(0)}{f(1)} = \frac{y}{1+y}$, and so $f(0) = y$.

Case 2: $y = 0$. Applying (8) with $a = 0$ and $b = 1$ yields $\frac{f(0)}{f(1)} \leq \frac{0}{1}$, which implies $f(0) = 0$. \square

A.3 WEF, WPROP^* , and WPROP

Lemma (3.6). *For any $x, y \in [0, 1]$ and $y' \geq (1 - \frac{\min_{i \in N} w_i}{w_N})y$, $\text{WEF}(x, y)$ implies $\text{WPROP}^*(x, y')$.*

In particular, $\text{WEF}(x, y)$ implies $\text{WPROP}^(x, y)$.*

Proof. Consider a $\text{WEF}(x, y)$ allocation A , and fix an arbitrary agent $i \in N$. If $A_i = M$, the $\text{WPROP}^*(x, y)$ condition is trivially satisfied for i , so assume that $A_i \subsetneq M$. For every $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$, the $\text{WEF}(x, y)$ condition implies that for some $B_j \subseteq A_j$ of size at most 1, we have

$$w_j \cdot u_i(A_i) \geq w_i \cdot u_i(A_j) - w_i x \cdot u_i(B_j) - w_j y \cdot u_i(B_j).$$

Let B be a singleton set containing i 's most valuable item in $M \setminus A_i$. Summing this inequality over all $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$ and adding $w_i \cdot u_i(A_i)$ to both sides, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
w_N \cdot u_i(A_i) &\geq w_i \cdot \sum_{j \in N} u_i(A_j) - w_i x \cdot \sum_{j \in N \setminus \{i\}} u_i(B_j) - y \cdot \sum_{j \in N \setminus \{i\}} w_j u_i(B_j) \\
&\geq w_i u_i(M) - w_i x \cdot \sum_{j \in N \setminus \{i\}} u_i(B_j) - y \cdot \sum_{j \in N \setminus \{i\}} w_j u_i(B) \\
&= w_i u_i(M) - w_i x \cdot \sum_{j \in N \setminus \{i\}} u_i(B_j) - u_i(B) \cdot (w_N - w_i) y.
\end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$(w_N - w_i)y \leq (w_N - \min_{k \in N} w_k)y \leq w_N y'.$$

Combining this with the above inequality and rearranging yields

$$u_i(A_i) + y' \cdot u_i(B) \geq \frac{w_i}{w_N} \left(u_i(M) - x \cdot \sum_{j \in N \setminus \{i\}} u_i(B_j) \right).$$

Hence, the $\text{WPROP}^*(x, y')$ condition is satisfied for agent i .

The second part of the lemma follows from the fact that $y \geq (1 - \frac{\min_{i \in N} w_i}{w_N})y$. \square

Lemma (3.7). For any $x, y \in [0, 1]$ and $x' \geq (1 - \frac{1}{n})x$, $\text{WPROP}^*(x, y)$ implies $\text{WPROP}(x', y)$.

In particular, $\text{WPROP}^*(x, y)$ implies $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$.

Proof. Consider a $\text{WPROP}^*(x, y)$ allocation A , and fix an arbitrary agent $i \in N$. If $A_i = M$, the $\text{WPROP}(x', y)$ condition is trivially satisfied for i , so assume that $A_i \subsetneq M$. By definition of $\text{WPROP}^*(x, y)$, there exist $B \subseteq M \setminus A_i$ of size at most 1 and, for each $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$, $B_j \subseteq A_j$ of size at most 1 such that

$$\frac{u_i(A_i) + y \cdot u_i(B)}{w_i} \geq \frac{u_i(M) - x \cdot \sum_{j \in N \setminus \{i\}} u_i(B_j)}{w_N}.$$

In particular, this holds when B is a singleton set containing i 's most valuable item in $M \setminus A_i$. Since $u_i(B_j) \leq u_i(B)$ for all $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{u_i(A_i) + y \cdot u_i(B)}{w_i} &\geq \frac{u_i(M) - x \cdot \sum_{j \in N \setminus \{i\}} u_i(B)}{w_N} \\
&= \frac{u_i(M) - (n-1)x \cdot u_i(B)}{w_N} \\
&\geq \frac{u_i(M) - nx' \cdot u_i(B)}{w_N}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the $\text{WPROP}(x', y)$ condition is satisfied for agent i .

The second part of the lemma follows from the fact that $x \geq (1 - \frac{1}{n})x$. \square

A.4 Maximum weighted Nash welfare

Next, we address the relation between MWNW and WEF/WPROP relaxations. Chakraborty et al. (2020) proved that every MWNW allocation is WWEF1. By contrast, our next result shows that for any x , such an allocation is not guaranteed to be $\text{WEF}(x, 1-x)$ or even $\text{WPROP}(x, 1-x)$. This also means that for every x , WEF1 is strictly weaker than $\text{WEF}(x, 1-x)$.

Theorem (3.12). *For each $x \in [0, 1]$, there exists an instance with identical items in which no MWNW allocation is $WPROP(x, 1 - x)$.*

Proof. For $x < 1$, consider an instance with n identical items and n agents, with $n > w_1 > \frac{2-x}{1-x}$ (the range is nonempty when n is sufficiently large), and $w_2 = \dots = w_n = (n - w_1)/(n - 1)$, so $w_N = n$. Any MWNW allocation must give a single item to each agent. But this violates the $WPROP(x, 1 - x)$ condition for agent 1, since $\frac{1+(1-x)}{w_1} < \frac{2-x}{\frac{2-x}{1-x}} = 1 - x = \frac{n-nx}{w_N}$.

For $x = 1$, consider the instance used by Chakraborty et al. (2020, Prop. 4.1), with $c = 2$. Specifically, there are $n = 2$ agents with weights $w_1 = 1$ and $w_2 = k$ for some positive integer k , and $m = k + c + 2$ identical items. As Chakraborty et al. showed, when k is sufficiently large, every MWNW allocation gives exactly one item to agent 1. We have $\frac{1}{w_1} = 1 < \frac{k+c}{k+1} = \frac{(k+c+2)-2}{w_N}$, meaning that any MWNW allocation is not $WPROP(1, 0)$. \square

B Omitted Proofs — Section 4 — Share-based notions

Theorem (4.6). *For each n , there is no NMMS guarantee over all instances with n agents better than $1/n$ -NMMS.*

Proof. Let $g(n)$ be the best possible NMMS guarantee for n agents; we will show that $g(n) \leq 1/n$ for all n . To this end, we use the same instance as Farhadi et al. (2019, Thm. 2.1). There are n agents and $2n - 1$ items. Each agent $i < n$ has weight $w_i = \varepsilon \in (0, 1/n)$ while agent n has weight $w_n = 1 - (n - 1)\varepsilon$. The utilities are as follows:

$$u_i(j) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon & \text{if } j < n, \\ 1 - (n - 1)\varepsilon & \text{if } j = n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \forall i < n;$$

$$u_n(j) = \begin{cases} \frac{1-(n-1)\varepsilon}{n} & \text{if } j \leq n, \\ \varepsilon & \text{if } j > n. \end{cases}$$

The MMS, and therefore the NMMS, of each of the first $n - 1$ agents is positive. Thus, in order to provide them with a positive approximation of their NMMS, we must assign to each of them at least one of the first n items. This means that agent n is left with at most one of the first n items, and therefore utility at most

$$\beta := \frac{1 - (n - 1)\varepsilon}{n} + (n - 1)\varepsilon = \frac{1 + (n - 1)^2\varepsilon}{n}.$$

On the other hand, agent n 's MMS is $\frac{1-(n-1)\varepsilon}{n}$, so her NMMS is $(1 - (n - 1)\varepsilon)^2$. By definition of $g(n)$, we can ensure the agent a utility of at least $g(n) \cdot (1 - (n - 1)\varepsilon)^2$. Hence, we must have $g(n) \cdot (1 - (n - 1)\varepsilon)^2 \leq \beta$, or equivalently

$$g(n) \leq \frac{1 + (n - 1)^2\varepsilon}{n \cdot (1 - (n - 1)\varepsilon)^2}.$$

Taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ yields $g(n) \leq 1/n$, as desired. \square

Theorem (4.9). *Given an instance, if $u_i(g) \leq \text{NMMS}_i$ for all $i \in N$ and $g \in M$, then there exists a $1/2$ -NMMS allocation.*

Proof. We use an algorithm similar to Algorithm 2 of Farhadi et al. (2019) for WMMS. We normalize the weights so that $w_N = 1$. The algorithm proceeds as follows:

1. Scale the utilities of each agent i so that $\text{NMMS}_i = w_i n$. Consequently, we have $\text{MMS}_i^{1\text{-out-of-}n}(M) = 1$, and therefore $u_i(M) \geq n$.
2. Let the set of *unsatisfied agents* be the set of agents i whose current utility is less than $w_i n/2$. If this set is empty, the algorithm terminates.
3. Pick a pair $(i, g) \in N \times M$ that maximizes $u_i(g)$ among all unsatisfied agents and unallocated items. Allocate g to i .
4. If there are remaining items, go back to Step 2. Else, the algorithm terminates.

We will show that the allocation returned by the algorithm is $1/2$ -NMMS. Note that this allocation may be incomplete, in which case we can allocate the remaining items arbitrarily afterwards.

We first prove the following auxiliary claim on the (possibly incomplete) allocation returned by the algorithm: *For each agent i , $u_i(A_i) \leq w_i n$.* By the assumption of the theorem and the normalization in Step 1 of the algorithm, the claim holds for each agent i who receives at most one item. If an agent has already received one or more item and is still unsatisfied, this means that all items allocated to her together yield utility less than $w_i n/2$. Since items are allocated to each agent in descending order of their utility to the agent, this means that every remaining item yields utility less than $w_i n/2$ to i . As a result, i 's utility throughout the algorithm is always smaller than $w_i n/2 + w_i n/2 = w_i n$, thereby proving the claim.

Now, since each item is given to an unsatisfied agent who values it the most, the auxiliary claim implies that $u_i(A_j) \leq u_j(A_j) \leq w_j n$ for all agents i, j as long as i is unsatisfied. If all agents are satisfied, the theorem holds. Assume for contradiction that agent i remains unsatisfied at the end of the algorithm. Summing the previous inequality over all $j \neq i$ yields that, from i 's perspective, the total value of items allocated to all other agents is at most $\sum_{j \neq i} w_j n = n - w_i n$. Since $u_i(M) \geq n$, the total value of remaining items for i is at least $w_i n$, so agent i should be satisfied, a contradiction. \square

Theorem (4.11). *Any OEF1 allocation is also $1/n$ -NMMS.*

Proof. If $m < n$, every agent's NMMS is 0 and the theorem holds trivially, so assume that $m \geq n$. Consider an OEF1 allocation A , where the agents have been renumbered as in Definition 4.10. Fix an agent $i \in N$. For each $j \in \{i + 1, \dots, n\}$, we have

$$u_i(A_i) \geq u_i(A_j),$$

while for each $j \in \{1, \dots, i - 1\}$, there exists $B_j \subseteq A_j$ of size at most 1 such that

$$u_i(A_i) \geq u_i(A_j) - u_i(B_j).$$

Adding the above inequalities for all $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$ and then adding $u_i(A_i)$ to both sides, we get

$$n \cdot u_i(A_i) \geq u_i(M) - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} u_i(B_j).$$

Let H_{i-1} be the set containing the $i - 1$ most valuable items in M according to u_i , ties broken arbitrarily. We have $\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} u_i(B_j) \leq u_i(H_{i-1})$, so the above inequality implies

$$u_i(A_i) \geq \frac{u_i(M \setminus H_{i-1})}{n}.$$

Thus, in order to establish $1/n$ -NMMS for agent i , it suffices to show that

$$u_i(M \setminus H_{i-1}) \geq n \cdot \frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot \text{MMS}_i.$$

To this end, consider agent i 's maximin partition, that is, a partition $P^* = \{P_1^*, P_2^*, \dots, P_n^*\}$ such that $u_i(P_j^*) \geq \text{MMS}_i$ for all $j \in [n]$. Since H_{i-1} contains $i - 1$ items, at least $n - i + 1$ bundles in P^* do not

contain any item from H_{i-1} . This means that $u_i(M \setminus H_{i-1}) \geq (n - i + 1) \cdot \text{MMS}_i$. It therefore remains to show that

$$\frac{n - i + 1}{n} \geq \frac{w_i}{w_N}.$$

Recall that w_i is the i -th largest weight, so $w_i/w_N \leq 1/i$, and the above inequality reduces to showing that $\frac{n-i+1}{n} \geq \frac{1}{i}$. This is equivalent to $(n-i)(i-1) \geq 0$, which indeed holds since $1 \leq i \leq n$, completing the proof. \square

Theorem (4.12). *WMMS implies $1/n$ -NMMS, and the factor $1/n$ is tight.*

Proof. By definition, if A is a WMMS allocation, then for any agent $i \in N$,

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(A_i) &\geq w_i \cdot \max_{(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \in \Pi(M, n)} \min_{j \in [n]} \frac{u_i(Z_j)}{w_j} \\ &\geq w_i \cdot \max_{(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \in \Pi(M, n)} \min_{j \in [n]} \frac{u_i(Z_j)}{w_N} \\ &= \frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot \max_{(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \in \Pi(M, n)} \min_{j \in [n]} u_i(Z_j) = \frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot \text{MMS}_i = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \text{NMMS}_i. \end{aligned}$$

This establishes the first part of the theorem.

For the tightness, suppose there are $m = n$ items. Agent 1 has utility 1 for every item, while for each $i \geq 2$, agent i has utility 1 for item i and 0 for all other items. Suppose that $w_1 = 1 - (n-1)\varepsilon$ and $w_2 = \dots = w_n = \varepsilon$ for some small $\varepsilon > 0$. Consider the allocation that assigns item i to agent i for all $i \in N$. This is clearly WMMS-fair for agents $2, \dots, n$. Agent 1's WMMS is 1, and she also receives utility 1, so the allocation is WMMS-fair for her as well. On the other hand, her NMMS is $w_1 \cdot n$, which converges to n as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Hence, WMMS cannot offer more than a $1/n$ -NMMS guarantee. \square

Theorem (4.13). *For $n \geq 3$, NMMS does not imply any positive approximation of WMMS.*

Proof. Let $n \geq 3$, and consider an instance with n agents of weights $w_1 > w_2 > w_3 = \dots = w_n$ such that $w_1 + \dots + w_n = 1$, and n items. Agent 1 has utility w_2 for item 1, w_1 for item 2, and w_j for item $j \in \{3, \dots, n\}$. For each $i \geq 2$, agent i has utility 1 for item i and 0 for all other items. Consider the allocation that assigns item i to agent i for all $i \in N$. This is clearly NMMS-fair for agents $2, \dots, n$. Agent 1's WMMS is w_1 , while her NMMS is nw_1w_n .

We choose w_1, \dots, w_n in such a way that w_1 is close to 1 and w_2 is sufficiently close to $1 - w_1$ so that $w_2 > nw_1w_n$ (note that once w_1 and w_2 are fixed, w_3, \dots, w_n are also fixed). Since agent 1 receives utility w_2 from the allocation above, this allocation is NMMS-fair. However, as $w_1 \rightarrow 1$, the ratio w_2/w_1 converges to 0, so NMMS-fairness cannot imply any positive approximation of WMMS-fairness. \square

B.1 WEF/WPROP/MWNW vs. WMMS/NMMS

We know from Theorem 4.8 that $\text{WEF}(1, 0)$ implies $1/n$ -NMMS. The next result shows that $\text{WEF}(x, 1-x)$ for other values of x performs far worse.

Theorem B.1. *For each $x \geq 0$ and $y \in (0, 1]$, $\text{WEF}(x, y)$ does not imply any positive approximation of NMMS, even with identical valuations.*

Proof. Since $\text{WEF}(x, y)$ is stronger when x, y are smaller, it is sufficient to prove the claim for $x = 0$ and $y \in (0, 1]$. Assume that there are $m = n$ items: items $1, \dots, n-1$ have value 1 and item n has value y . The MMS, and therefore the NMMS, of every agent is positive. Suppose that agent 1 has weight w and every

other agent has weight $w' = \frac{1-w}{n-1}$, where $0 < w \leq \frac{1}{(1+1/y)(n-1)+1}$. Note that this upper bound is strictly positive and smaller than $\frac{1}{n}$ for all $y > 0$. This means that $w < \frac{1}{n}$, hence $w' > \frac{1-1/n}{n-1} = \frac{1}{n} > w$.

Consider an allocation that assigns no item to agent 1, two items—one of value 1 and one of value y —to agent 2, and one item of value 1 to each remaining agent. We claim that this allocation is $\text{WEF}(x, y)$. The condition holds for agents 2, 3, \dots , n , since they have the same weights and the difference in their utilities is at most y . To establish the claim, it therefore suffices to verify the $\text{WEF}(x, y)$ condition for agent 1 towards agent 2. This condition is

$$\frac{0 + y}{w} \geq \frac{1 + y}{\frac{1-w}{n-1}};$$

this simplifies to $w \leq \frac{1}{(1+1/y)(n-1)+1}$, which holds by our choice of w . Hence, the allocation under consideration is $\text{WEF}(x, y)$. However, agent 1 receives utility 0 in this allocation even though her NMMS is positive. \square

Theorem B.1 implies that $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$ does not yield any positive approximation of NMMS for any $x \geq 0$ and $y > 0$. We show next that the same is true for $\text{WPROP}(1, 0)$, which also reveals a weakness of $\text{WPROP}(1, 0)$ in comparison to $\text{WPROP}^*(1, 0)$ (cf. Lemma 4.7).

Corollary B.2. *For each $x \in [0, 1]$, $\text{WPROP}(x, 1 - x)$ does not imply any positive approximation of NMMS.*

Proof. The case $x \in [0, 1)$ follows from Theorem B.1, so assume that $x = 1$. Consider the same instance and allocation as in Theorem B.1. We claim that this allocation is $\text{WPROP}(1, 0)$. Indeed, this follows by observing that for each $i \in N$, if $A_i \neq M$, then

$$\frac{u_i(A_i)}{w_i} \geq 0 = \frac{n - n \cdot 1}{w_N}.$$

In this allocation, agent 1 receives utility 0 even though her NMMS is positive. \square

The following is also a consequence of Theorem B.1.

Corollary B.3. *WWEF1 does not imply any positive approximation of NMMS.*

Next, we show an analog of Theorem B.1 for WMMS.

Theorem B.4. *For each $x \in [0, 1]$, $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ does not imply any positive approximation of WMMS.*

Proof. The case $x = 1$ was already handled by Chakraborty et al. (2020, Prop. 6.2), so assume that $x \in [0, 1)$.

Suppose we have n agents with weights satisfying $1 > w_1 > w_2 > \dots > w_{n-1} > \frac{w_n}{2} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{5-x}{1-x}}\right) > 0$. Note that since $\sqrt{\frac{5-x}{1-x}} > 1$, we have $w_i > w_n$ for all $i \in N \setminus \{n\}$. For each $i \in N \setminus \{n\}$, let agent i value item i at 1 and every other item at 0; let agent n value item j at w_j for all $j \in [n]$. Hence, agent n 's WMMS is $w_n > 0$.

Now, consider the allocation that assigns item i to agent i for every $i \in N \setminus \{n-1, n\}$, items $n-1$ and n to agent $n-1$, and no item to agent n . We claim that this allocation is $\text{WEF}(x, 1-x)$. To prove this claim, it suffices to show that the $\text{WEF}(x, 1-x)$ condition from agent n towards all other agents is fulfilled. The condition towards agent $j \leq n-2$ is

$$\frac{0 + (1-x) \cdot w_j}{w_n} \geq \frac{w_j - x \cdot w_j}{w_j},$$

which holds since $w_j > w_n$. The condition from agent n towards agent $n - 1$ is

$$\frac{0 + (1 - x) \cdot w_{n-1}}{w_n} \geq \frac{(w_{n-1} + w_n) - x \cdot w_{n-1}}{w_{n-1}}.$$

Upon simplification, this becomes

$$(1 - x)\gamma_n^2 - (1 - x)\gamma_n - 1 \geq 0,$$

where $\gamma_n := \frac{w_{n-1}}{w_n}$. Note that the roots of the equation

$$(1 - x)t^2 - (1 - x)t - 1 = 0$$

are $t = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 \pm \sqrt{\frac{5-x}{1-x}} \right)$. Since $\gamma_n > \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{5-x}{1-x}} \right)$, the desired inequality holds and the allocation is WEF($x, 1 - x$). But agent n receives utility 0 in this allocation even though her WMMS is positive. \square

Corollary B.5. For $x \in [0, 1]$, $WPROP(x, 1 - x)$ does not imply any positive approximation of WMMS.

Could an MWNW allocation imply some approximation of NMMS or WMMS? We show that the answer is no, even when $n = 2$.

Theorem B.6. Even for $n = 2$, MWNW does not imply any positive approximation of NMMS.

Proof. Let $f : [1, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be the function $f(x) = \frac{2^{x-1}-1}{1+x}$ for all $x \in [1, \infty)$. Note that $f(1) = 0$ and $f(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, we have

$$f'(x) = \frac{2^{x-1}((1+x) \ln 2 - 1) + 1}{(1+x)^2} > 0$$

for all $x \geq 1$, since $(1+x) \ln 2 - 1 \geq 2 \ln 2 - 1 > 0$. Hence, f is strictly increasing in $[1, \infty)$, and the inverse function f^{-1} is well-defined. For $\varepsilon \in (0, 0.5)$, we have $\frac{1}{2\varepsilon} > 1$, so $f^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2\varepsilon}\right)$ is defined and in the range $(3.44, \infty)$. This means that $\frac{1}{f^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2\varepsilon}\right)}$ belongs to the range $(0, 0.29)$.

Let $n = 2$, $m = 3$, $\varepsilon < 0.5$ be a small positive constant, and $0 < w < \frac{1}{f^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2\varepsilon}\right)}$. The weights are $w_1 = w$ and $w_2 = 1 - w$. The agents' utilities for the items are given by the following table:

Item	1	2	3
u_1	2ε	$1 + \frac{1}{w}$	$1 + \frac{1}{w}$
u_2	0	1	1

Clearly, an MWNW allocation must assign item 1 to agent 1, and agent 2 must receive either one or both of items 2 and 3, which are interchangeable. We claim that the unique MWNW allocation assigns item 1 to agent 1 and items 2 and 3 to agent 2. To prove this claim, it suffices to show that

$$(2\varepsilon)^w \cdot 2^{1-w} > \left(2\varepsilon + 1 + \frac{1}{w} \right)^w \cdot 1^{1-w}.$$

This reduces to

$$2^{1-w} > \left(1 + \frac{1 + \frac{1}{w}}{2\varepsilon} \right)^w,$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{2^{\frac{1}{w}-1} - 1}{1 + \frac{1}{w}} > \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}.$$

The left-hand side is simply $f(1/w)$. Since $f^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2\varepsilon}\right) < \frac{1}{w}$ and f is strictly increasing, we have $\frac{1}{2\varepsilon} < f(1/w)$, as desired. This proves the claim that agent 1 receives only item 1 in the unique MWNW allocation, and thereby a utility of 2ε .

Finally, since $2\varepsilon < 1 < 1 + \frac{1}{w}$, agent 1's MMS is $1 + \frac{1}{w}$. Therefore, her NMMS is $\frac{w}{w+(1-w)} \cdot 2 \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{w}\right) = 2(w+1) > 2$. This means that agent 1 receives less than ε times her NMMS. The conclusion of the theorem follows by taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

The example in Theorem B.6 can also be used to show an analogous result for WMMS.

Theorem B.7. *Even for $n = 2$, MWNW does not imply any positive approximation of WMMS.*

Proof. Consider the instance in Theorem B.6, where we have shown that agent 1 receives utility 2ε in any MWNW allocation. By considering the partition in which agent 1 receives item 3 and agent 2 receives items 1 and 2, we find that agent 1's WMMS is at least

$$\min \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{w}, \frac{w}{1-w} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{w} + 2\varepsilon \right) \right\}.$$

Clearly, $1 + \frac{1}{w} > 1$. Moreover, $\frac{w}{1-w} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{w} + 2\varepsilon \right) = \frac{w+1+2\varepsilon w}{1-w}$ is greater than 1 because the numerator is greater than 1 while the denominator is less than 1. Hence, agent 1's WMMS is at least 1. The desired conclusion follows by taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

In the unweighted setting, Caragiannis et al. (2019, Thm. 4.1) proved that maximum Nash welfare implies $\Theta(1/\sqrt{n})$ -MMS. Theorems B.6 and B.7 show that this result cannot be generalized to the weighted setting through NMMS or WMMS.

C Omitted Proofs — Section 5 — Identical items

C.1 Weighted envy-freeness

Theorem C.1. *WEF($x, 1-x$) implies upper quota if and only if $x = 1$, and implies lower quota if and only if $x = 0$.*

Proof. We start with the positive claims.

First, let $x = 1$, and consider any WEF(1, 0) allocation. For any $i, j \in N$, it holds that $\frac{a_i}{w_i} \geq \frac{a_j-1}{w_j}$, that is, $a_i \geq w_i \cdot \frac{a_j-1}{w_j}$. Fixing j and summing this over all $i \in N \setminus \{j\}$, we get

$$m - a_j \geq (w_N - w_j) \cdot \frac{a_j - 1}{w_j}.$$

Adding $a_j - 1$ to both sides yields

$$m - 1 \geq w_N \cdot \frac{a_j - 1}{w_j},$$

which implies that $a_j \leq q_j - \frac{w_j}{w_N} + 1 < \lceil q_j \rceil + 1$. Since a_j and $\lceil q_j \rceil$ are integers, we have $a_j \leq \lceil q_j \rceil$, meaning that upper quota is fulfilled.

Next, let $x = 0$, and consider any WEF(0, 1) allocation. For any $i, j \in N$, it holds that $\frac{a_i+1}{w_i} \geq \frac{a_j}{w_j}$, that is, $w_j \cdot \left(\frac{a_i+1}{w_i}\right) \geq a_j$. Fixing i and summing this over all $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$, we get

$$(w_N - w_i) \left(\frac{a_i + 1}{w_i}\right) \geq m - a_i.$$

Adding $a_i + 1$ to both sides yields

$$\frac{w_N}{w_i} \cdot (a_i + 1) \geq m + 1,$$

which implies that $a_i \geq q_i + \frac{w_i}{w_N} - 1 > \lfloor q_i \rfloor - 1$. Since a_i and $\lfloor q_i \rfloor$ are integers, we have $a_i \geq \lfloor q_i \rfloor$, meaning that lower quota is fulfilled.

For the negative part of the theorem, we prove an even stronger claim: we prove that for any $x > 0$, there exists an instance in which no $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ allocation satisfies lower quota; and for any $x < 1$, there exists an instance in which no $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ allocation satisfies upper quota. This implies, in addition to the present theorem, that no rule satisfying both quotas can guarantee $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ for any $x \in [0, 1]$.

Assume first that $x > 0$. Choose some integer $n > 2/x$, and let $m = n$. The entitlements are $w_1 = 2$ and $w_2 = \dots = w_n = \frac{n-2}{n-1}$, so that $w_N = n$. We claim that in any $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ allocation, every agent receives exactly one item. Consider an allocation in which some low-entitlement agent gets no item while agent 1 gets two or more items. In order for the $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ condition for the low-entitlement agent with respect to agent 1 to hold, we need

$$\frac{0 + (1 - x)}{\frac{n-2}{n-1}} \geq \frac{2 - x}{2} \iff 2 - nx \geq 0$$

which is violated when $n > 2/x$. By a similar reasoning, any allocation in which some agent receives no item while another agent receives two or more items cannot be $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$. Therefore, in a $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ allocation, every agent must get exactly one item. But agent 1's quota is 2, so lower quota is violated.

Assume now that $x < 1$. Choose some integer n for which $\frac{n-1}{(n-1)^2-1} < 1 - x$ (such an n exists because the left-hand side approaches 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$). Let $m = n$, $w_1 = n - 1$, and $w_2 = \dots = w_n = 1/(n - 1)$, so that $w_N = n$. Consider an allocation in which some low-entitlement agent gets at least one item, while agent 1 gets at most $n - 1$ items. In order for the $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ condition for agent 1 with respect to the low-entitlement agent to hold, we need

$$\frac{(n - 1) + (1 - x)}{n - 1} \geq \frac{1 - x}{\frac{1}{n-1}} \iff \frac{n - 1}{(n - 1)^2 - 1} \geq 1 - x,$$

which is violated when $\frac{n-1}{(n-1)^2-1} < 1 - x$. Therefore, in a $\text{WEF}(x, 1 - x)$ allocation, agent 1 must get all n items. But agent 1's quota is $n - 1$, so upper quota is violated. \square

C.2 Weighted proportionality

Theorem C.2. *For each $x \in [0, 1]$, $\text{WPROP}(x, 1 - x)$ implies neither lower quota nor upper quota, even for two agents with equal entitlements.*

Proof. With m identical items, the condition for $\text{WPROP}(x, y)$ for all $i \in N$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a_i + y}{w_i} &\geq \frac{m - nx}{w_N} \\ \iff a_i &\geq \frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot m - \frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot nx - y. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Consider an instance with $n = m = 2$ and $w_1 = w_2 = 1/2$, and an allocation that gives both items to agent 2. Condition (9) is obviously satisfied for agent 2, and for agent 1 it becomes

$$0 \geq 1 - x - y,$$

which is satisfied whenever $y = 1 - x$. Since both agents have a quota of 1, both lower quota and upper quota are violated in this $\text{WPROP}(x, 1 - x)$ allocation. \square

C.3 WMMS and NMMS

Theorem C.3. *For all $n \geq 3$, WMMS-fairness and NMMS-fairness imply neither lower quota nor upper quota. Moreover, there exists an instance in which a WMMS-fair allocation exists but no such allocation (or any positive approximation thereof) satisfies lower quota; the same holds for NMMS-fairness.*

Proof. For the first statement, let $n \geq 3$ and $m = n - 1$. Clearly, the WMMS and NMMS of every agent are both 0 regardless of the weights, so every allocation is WMMS- and NMMS-fair. However, if all items are given to an agent with the smallest entitlement, upper quota is violated for this agent, since the agent's upper quota is at most $\lceil m/n \rceil = 1$. Lower quota is also violated in the same allocation as long as there is an agent whose weight is at least w_N/m .

We proceed to the second statement. For WMMS, let $m = n$ and suppose the entitlements are $w_1 = 2$ and $w_2 = \dots = w_n = \frac{n-2}{n-1}$, so $w_N = n$ and $q_1 = 2$. Since all agents have the same utility function, a WMMS-fair allocation exists by definition. Moreover, the WMMS of all agents is positive, since they can partition the items into n bundles with a positive value (specifically, the WMMS of each agent i is $w_i \cdot \frac{1}{w_1}$, so $\text{WMMS}_1 = 1$ and $\text{WMMS}_2 = \dots = \text{WMMS}_n = \frac{n-2}{2n-2}$). Therefore, the unique allocation that provides any positive approximation of WMMS-fairness is the one giving a single item to each agent. However, in this allocation, the lower quota of agent 1 is violated.

For NMMS, let $m = 2n - 1$ and suppose the entitlements are $w_1 = n + 1$ and $w_2 = \dots = w_n = \frac{n-2}{n-1}$, so $w_N = 2n - 1 = m$ and $q_1 = w_1 = n + 1$. The MMS of every agent is 1, so $\text{NMMS}_1 = \frac{n(n+1)}{2n-1}$, which is less than n for all $n \geq 3$, and $\text{NMMS}_2 = \dots = \text{NMMS}_n = \frac{n(n-2)}{(2n-1)(n-1)} \in (0, 1)$. There exist NMMS-fair allocations, for example, giving one item to each low-entitlement agent and n items to agent 1. But every allocation providing a positive approximation to NMMS-fairness must give at least one item to each low-entitlement agent, so the lower quota of agent 1 is violated. \square

The incompatibility result requires $n \geq 3$; we show next that this is not a coincidence.

Theorem C.4. *When $n = 2$, both WMMS-fairness and NMMS-fairness imply both lower and upper quota.*

Proof. Let $n = 2$. Since $a_1 + a_2 = q_1 + q_2 = m$, we have $a_1 \geq \lfloor q_1 \rfloor$ if and only if $a_2 \leq \lceil q_2 \rceil$. This means that an allocation either satisfies both lower and upper quotas, or neither. Hence, it suffices to check one of the two quotas; we will check the lower quota.

Consider the following quantity:

$$\gamma(A) := \min_{j \in \{1,2\}} \frac{|A_j|}{w_j}.$$

By definition of WMMS, a WMMS-fair allocation A must maximize $\gamma(A)$. In more detail, assume that the maximum is γ_{\max} , and consider an allocation A' with $\gamma(A') < \gamma_{\max}$. In A' , there exists an agent j with $|A'_j| = \gamma(A')w_j < \gamma_{\max}w_j$. This agent receives utility less than her WMMS, which is $\gamma_{\max}w_j$, so A' is not WMMS-fair, proving our claim.

Now, consider a WMMS-fair allocation A , which attains $\gamma(A) = \gamma_{\max}$. If $|A_j| \leq \lfloor q_j \rfloor - 1$ for some $j \in N$, then $|A_{3-j}| \geq \lceil q_{3-j} \rceil + 1$, so we can obtain a larger γ by moving one item from agent $(3-j)$'s bundle to agent j 's bundle, a contradiction. Hence, $|A_j| \geq \lfloor q_j \rfloor$, and lower quota is satisfied.

For NMMS, let $z_i := w_i/w_N$ for each $i \in N$, and note that agent i 's MMS is $\lfloor m/2 \rfloor$, so the NMMS is $2z_i \cdot \lfloor m/2 \rfloor \geq (m-1)z_i$. Hence, in an NMMS-fair allocation, agent i receives at least $\lceil (m-1)z_i \rceil$ items. Since $z_i < 1$, this quantity is at least $\lfloor (m-1)z_i + z_i \rfloor = \lfloor mz_i \rfloor$, which is exactly agent i 's lower quota. \square

C.4 OMMS and APS

Theorem C.5. *Both OMMS-fairness and APS-fairness imply lower quota for all n . Both notions also imply upper quota when $n = 2$, but not when $n \geq 3$.*

Proof. We claim that both the OMMS and the APS of each agent $i \in N$ equal i 's lower quota $\lfloor q_i \rfloor$. To see this, in the definition of OMMS, take $\ell = \lfloor q_i \rfloor$ and $d = m$. With the d -partition in which each part contains exactly one item, we find that $\text{MMS}_i^{\lfloor q_i \rfloor\text{-out-of-}m}(M) = \lfloor q_i \rfloor$. Since $\lfloor q_i \rfloor/m \leq q_i/m = w_i/w_N$, we have $\text{OMMS}_i^w(M) \geq \lfloor q_i \rfloor$. On the other hand, Babaioff, Ezra, and Feige (2021) showed that an agent's OMMS is always at most her APS, which, in turn, is always at most her proportional share; in this case, the proportional share is q_i for agent i . Since all utilities are integers, the OMMS and APS are both integers, so they both equal $\lfloor q_i \rfloor$. It follows that OMMS-fairness and APS-fairness imply lower quota.

When $n = 2$, as in the proof of Theorem C.4, upper quota follows immediately from lower quota. Let $n \geq 3$, $m = n - 1$, and suppose that all agents have the same weight. From the previous paragraph, each agent's OMMS and APS are both 0, so every allocation is OMMS- and APS-fair. However, if all items are given to the same agent, then upper quota is violated since the agent's upper quota is 1. \square

C.5 Maximum weighted Nash welfare

Theorem C.6. *MWNW implies neither lower quota nor upper quota.*

Proof. With m identical items, an MWNW allocation corresponds to a partition of m into $a_1 + \dots + a_n$ that is in

$$\arg \max_{a_1 + \dots + a_n = m} \prod_{i=1}^n a_i^{w_i}$$

For lower quota, for any $n \geq 3$, consider an instance with $m = n$ items. Every MWNW allocation gives a single item to each agent regardless of the entitlements. This violates lower quota for agents with a sufficiently high entitlement—specifically, for any agent i with $w_i/w_N \geq 2/n$.

For upper quota, consider an instance with $n = 4$ agents, with $w_1 = w$, $w_2 = w_3 = w_4 = 1$, and $m = 4(w + 3)/3 = 4 + 4w/3$. The value of w will be chosen to ensure that m is an integer. The upper (and lower) quota of agent 1 is exactly $4w/3 = m - 4$. Satisfying agent 1's upper quota means that agents 2, 3, and 4 together must get at least four items. Clearly, in an MWNW allocation, each of them should get at least one item.

- If together they get (exactly) four items, then the WNW is $(m - 4)^w \cdot 2$;
- If together they get three items, then the WNW is $(m - 3)^w \cdot 1$.

We will choose w so that the latter quantity is larger, that is:

$$\begin{aligned} (m - 3)^w \cdot 1 &> (m - 4)^w \cdot 2 \\ \iff \left(\frac{4w}{3} + 1\right)^w &> \left(\frac{4w}{3}\right)^w \cdot 2 \\ \iff \left(1 + \frac{3}{4w}\right)^w &> 2 \end{aligned}$$

This is satisfied, for example, for $w = 6$. Then $m = 12$. Agent 1's quota is 8. In order to find an MWNW allocation, we consider several cases regarding the value of a_1 .

- If $a_1 = 9$, then the maximum possible WNW is $9^6 \cdot 1 \cdot 1 \cdot 1 = 531441$.
- If $a_1 = 8$, then the maximum possible WNW is $8^6 \cdot 1 \cdot 1 \cdot 2 = 524288$.

- If $a_1 = 7$, then the maximum possible WNW is $7^6 \cdot 1 \cdot 2 \cdot 2 = 470596$.
- If $a_1 = 6$, then the maximum possible WNW is $6^6 \cdot 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 2 = 373248$.

Other options clearly lead to a smaller WNW. So agent 1 gets 9 items in any MWNW allocation, which is above her upper quota. \square

Our examples use 3 and 4 agents, respectively. Below we show that for $n = 2$ agents, MWNW satisfies both quotas. In fact, we prove a slightly more general result.

Theorem C.7. *For any two agents i and j (possibly among other agents), in any MWNW allocation,*

$$\left\lfloor \frac{w_i(a_i + a_j)}{w_i + w_j} \right\rfloor \leq a_i \leq \left\lceil \frac{w_i(a_i + a_j)}{w_i + w_j} \right\rceil.$$

Proof. Fix the bundles allocated to all agents except i and j , so that $a_i + a_j$ is fixed too. Denote this sum by m_0 and denote $w := \frac{w_i}{w_i + w_j}$. From the definition of an MWNW allocation, it follows that for the (fixed) integer m_0 , (a_i, a_j) is an integer partition of m_0 that maximizes the weighted Nash welfare restricted to agents i and j . In other words, a_i is an integer maximizing the following function:

$$f(a_i) := a_i^w \cdot (m_0 - a_i)^{1-w}$$

By taking the derivative of this function, one finds that, if a_i could be any real number, then f is uniquely maximized at $a_i = w \cdot m_0$. Moreover, the function is concave, so it increases up to the maximum and then decreases. Therefore, $f(a_i) < f(\lfloor wm_0 \rfloor)$ for all $a_i < \lfloor wm_0 \rfloor$, and $f(a_i) > f(\lceil wm_0 \rceil)$ for all $a_i > \lceil wm_0 \rceil$. So the maximum weighted Nash welfare is attained when either $a_i = \lfloor wm_0 \rfloor$ or $a_i = \lceil wm_0 \rceil$, as claimed. \square

Corollary C.8. *With $n = 2$ agents, MWNW satisfies both lower and upper quota.*

Interestingly, despite failing lower quota in the case of three agents, MWNW satisfies upper quota in this case.⁸

Theorem C.9. *With $n = 3$ agents, MWNW satisfies upper quota.*

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that $w_N = 1$. If $m \leq 2$, each agent gets at most one item in any MWNW allocation due to the tie-breaking convention, and upper quota holds trivially. Assume therefore that $m \geq 3$. Suppose that an MWNW allocation assigns a_i items to agent i . Since the maximum weighted Nash welfare is nonzero, we must have $a_i \geq 1$ for all i . By symmetry, it suffices to show that $a_3 \leq \lceil w_3 m \rceil$. This is clearly true if $a_3 = 1$, so assume that $a_3 \geq 2$. We will show that $a_3 - 1 < w_3 m$, which implies the desired conclusion.

Since the allocation (a_1, a_2, a_3) yields a higher or equal weighted Nash welfare than $(a_1 + 1, a_2, a_3 - 1)$, we have

$$a_1^{w_1} a_2^{w_2} a_3^{w_3} \geq (a_1 + 1)^{w_1} a_2^{w_2} (a_3 - 1)^{w_3}.$$

This can be rewritten as

$$w_1 \leq w_3 \cdot \frac{\log\left(\frac{a_3}{a_3 - 1}\right)}{\log\left(\frac{a_1 + 1}{a_1}\right)}. \quad (10)$$

Similarly, comparing the allocation (a_1, a_2, a_3) with $(a_1, a_2 + 1, a_3 - 1)$, we get

$$w_2 \leq w_3 \cdot \frac{\log\left(\frac{a_3}{a_3 - 1}\right)}{\log\left(\frac{a_2 + 1}{a_2}\right)}. \quad (11)$$

⁸We are grateful to Ewan Delanoy for help with this proof: <https://math.stackexchange.com/a/4271210/29780>

Adding up (10) and (11) and recalling that $w_1 + w_2 + w_3 = 1$, we get $w_3 \geq S_1$, where

$$S_1 := \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\log\left(\frac{a_3}{a_3-1}\right)}{\log\left(\frac{a_1+1}{a_1}\right)} + \frac{\log\left(\frac{a_3}{a_3-1}\right)}{\log\left(\frac{a_2+1}{a_2}\right)}}.$$

In order to show that $a_3 - 1 < w_3 m$, it suffices to show that $S_2 > 0$, where

$$S_2 := S_1 - \frac{a_3 - 1}{m} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\log\left(\frac{a_3}{a_3-1}\right)}{\log\left(\frac{a_1+1}{a_1}\right)} + \frac{\log\left(\frac{a_3}{a_3-1}\right)}{\log\left(\frac{a_2+1}{a_2}\right)}} - \frac{a_3 - 1}{a_1 + a_2 + a_3}.$$

Let us write $z = \frac{a_3}{a_3-1}$, so that $a_3 = \frac{z}{z-1}$; we have $z \in (1, 2]$. We can rewrite S_2 as

$$S_2 = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\log z}{\log\left(\frac{a_1+1}{a_1}\right)} + \frac{\log z}{\log\left(\frac{a_2+1}{a_2}\right)}} - \frac{1}{(a_1 + a_2 + 1)z - (a_1 + a_2)}.$$

It therefore suffices to show that $S_3 > 0$, where

$$\begin{aligned} S_3 &:= ((a_1 + a_2 + 1)z - (a_1 + a_2)) - \left(1 + \frac{\log z}{\log\left(\frac{a_1+1}{a_1}\right)} + \frac{\log z}{\log\left(\frac{a_2+1}{a_2}\right)}\right) \\ &= (a_1 + a_2 + 1)(z - 1) - \left(\frac{\log z}{\log\left(\frac{a_1+1}{a_1}\right)} + \frac{\log z}{\log\left(\frac{a_2+1}{a_2}\right)}\right) \\ &\geq (a_1 + a_2 + 1)(z - 1) - \left(\frac{z - 1}{\log\left(\frac{a_1+1}{a_1}\right)} + \frac{z - 1}{\log\left(\frac{a_2+1}{a_2}\right)}\right) \\ &= (z - 1) \left(\left(a_1 - \frac{1}{\log\left(\frac{a_1+1}{a_1}\right)}\right) + \left(a_2 - \frac{1}{\log\left(\frac{a_2+1}{a_2}\right)}\right) + 1 \right); \end{aligned}$$

for the inequality we use the well-known fact that $1 + \log x \leq x$, which holds for all $x > 0$. Hence,

$$S_3 \geq (z - 1)(f(a_1) + f(a_2) + 1),$$

where $f(x) := x - \frac{1}{\log\left(\frac{x+1}{x}\right)}$. Assume without loss of generality that $f(a_1) \leq f(a_2)$. In order to show that $S_3 > 0$, it remains to show that $2f(a_1) + 1 > 0$, that is, $2m_1 + 1 > \frac{2}{\log\left(\frac{a_1+1}{a_1}\right)}$. This is equivalent to $g(a_1) > 0$, where

$$g(x) := \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{x}\right) - \frac{2}{2x + 1}.$$

The derivative of g is

$$g'(x) = -\frac{1}{x(x+1)} + \frac{4}{(2x+1)^2} = -\frac{1}{x(x+1)(2x+1)^2},$$

which is negative for every $x > 0$. This means that g is decreasing in the range $[1, \infty)$, and so $g(a_1) > \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} g(x) = 0$, completing the proof. \square

C.6 Weighted egalitarian rule

Theorem (5.2). *With identical items, every WEG allocation satisfies both lower and upper quota.*

Proof. With m identical items, a WEG allocation corresponds to a partition of m into $a_1 + \dots + a_n$ that is in

$$\arg \max_{a_1 + \dots + a_n = m} \operatorname{leximin}_{i \in N} (a_i - q_i),$$

where $q_i = \frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot m$. Let $d_i := a_i - q_i$. For every agent i :

- $d_i > -1$ if and only if i gets at least her lower quota $\lfloor q_i \rfloor$;
- $d_i < 1$ if and only if i gets at most her upper quota $\lceil q_i \rceil$.

There exists an allocation in which every agent gets at least her lower quota, so $\min_{i \in N} d_i > -1$ in such an allocation. Therefore, the same must hold for a WEG allocation, so this allocation satisfies lower quota for all agents.

If upper quota is violated for some agent i , then $d_i \geq 1$ and there is another agent j for whom $d_j < 0$. If a single item is moved from i to j , then d_i remains nonnegative while d_j increases, so the leximin vector strictly improves. Therefore, a WEG allocation satisfies upper quota for all agents. \square

Remark C.10. By the proof of Theorem C.1, since WEG satisfies both quotas, it cannot imply $\operatorname{WEF}(x, 1-x)$ for any $x \in [0, 1]$. Similarly, by Theorem C.3, it cannot imply any positive approximation to WMMS or NMMS.

C.7 Weighted egalitarian rule with binary valuations

We now prove that the WEG rule has desirable properties in the slightly more general setting of *binary additive* utilities. In this setting, for each agent i there is a set $Z_i \subseteq M$ of items with a value of 1, and the value of the other items is 0. Denote $z_i := |Z_i|$ = the number of items valued positively by agent i . We assume without loss of generality that each item is valued positively (at 1) by at least one agent. For convenience, we assume throughout this section that the weights are normalized so that $w_N = 1$.

The proportional share of agent i is $q_i := \frac{w_i}{w_N} \cdot z_i = w_i z_i$. Since the OMMS and APS are at most the proportional share, and both of them are integers, we have that both shares are at most $\lfloor q_i \rfloor$. We will prove that every WEG allocation guarantees to each agent i a value of at least $\lfloor q_i \rfloor$, which means that it is APS-fair and OMMS-fair. To this end, we need some lemmas.

Lemma C.11. *In any allocation A , If $|A_i \cap Z_i| < w_i z_i$ for some agent i , then $|A_j \cap Z_i| > w_j z_i$ for some other agent j .*

Proof. We can decompose $|Z_i|$ into a sum of n elements in two ways:

$$|Z_i| = \sum_{j=1}^n |A_j \cap Z_i| \quad \text{since the } A_j \text{'s are pairwise disjoint;}$$

$$|Z_i| = z_i = \sum_{j=1}^n w_j z_i \quad \text{since } \sum_{j=1}^n w_j = 1.$$

Subtracting the term $|A_i \cap Z_i|$ from both sums gives:

$$\sum_{j \neq i} |A_j \cap Z_i| = \sum_{j \neq i} w_j z_i + w_i z_i - |A_i \cap Z_i|$$

$$> \sum_{j \neq i} w_j z_i \quad \text{since } |A_i \cap Z_i| < w_i z_i,$$

so there is some $j \neq i$ such that $|A_j \cap Z_i| > w_j z_i$, as claimed. \square

We define the *quota graph* of an allocation A as the directed graph in which the vertices correspond to the agents, and there is an edge from i to j if and only if $|A_i \cap Z_i| < w_i z_i$ and $|A_j \cap Z_i| > w_j z_i$. Lemma C.11 implies that each agent i with $|A_i \cap Z_i| < w_i z_i$ has at least one outgoing edge.

In what follows, we consider only *wasteless* allocations, that is, allocations in which each item is allocated to an agent who values it at 1. In other words, $A_i \subseteq Z_i$ for all $i \in N$.

Lemma C.12. *Let A be any wasteless allocation. Suppose that in the quota graph of A , there are edges $i \rightarrow j \rightarrow k$ (where possibly $i = k$). Then $z_i < z_j$.*

Proof. The edge entering j implies

$$w_j z_i < |A_j \cap Z_i| \leq |A_j| = |A_j \cap Z_j|,$$

while the edge exiting j implies

$$|A_j \cap Z_j| < w_j z_j.$$

Combining the two inequalities gives $z_i < z_j$. \square

Since the inequality in Lemma C.12 cannot hold simultaneously for all pairs of adjacent vertices in a directed cycle, we have the following corollary.

Corollary C.13. *The quota graph of a wasteless allocation has no directed cycles.*

Let $a_i := |A_i| = |A_i \cap Z_i|$, and let $d_i := \frac{u_i(A_i)}{u_i(M)} - \frac{w_i}{w_N} = \frac{a_i}{z_i} - w_i$ for all $i \in N$. By definition, a WEG allocation maximizes the leximin vector of the d_i 's.

Theorem C.14. *With binary valuations, every WEG allocation gives each agent i a value of at least $\lfloor q_i \rfloor = \lfloor w_i z_i \rfloor$.*

Proof. Let A be a WEG allocation (which is necessarily wasteless). Suppose for contradiction that for some agent, say agent 1, we have $a_1 < \lfloor q_1 \rfloor$. Since both quantities are integers, this implies $a_1 \leq \lfloor q_1 \rfloor - 1 = \lfloor w_1 z_1 \rfloor - 1 \leq w_1 z_1 - 1$, and so $d_1 \leq -1/z_1$.

We show that it is possible to “transfer” one unit of utility from some agent k to agent 1, so that the leximin vector of the d_i 's strictly improves. This contradicts the assumption that the original allocation A is a WEG allocation. More precisely, we show that, for some agent $k \neq 1$, there is a different allocation A' in which all agents except agents 1 and k have the same utility as in A' , $a'_k = a_k - 1$, $a'_1 = a_1 + 1$, and $d'_k > -1/z_1$. This implies that the leximin vector of A' is better than the leximin vector of A .

Starting from agent 1, we will renumber the remaining agents. In particular, we follow the edges of the quota graph (picking an outgoing edge arbitrarily if there are two or more), and number the agents 2, 3, and so on. Corollary C.13 implies that this walk must end at some agent k with no outgoing edges, that is, $a_k \geq w_k z_k$. Note that, by definition of the quota graph, $|A_{j+1} \cap Z_j| > w_{j+1} z_j$ for all $j \in [k-1]$; in particular, $A_{j+1} \cap Z_j \neq \emptyset$.

We transfer one item from each set $A_{j+1} \cap Z_j$ (which is currently allocated to agent $j+1$) to agent j , for all $j \in [k-1]$. This transfer decreases the utility of agent k by 1, increases the utility of agent 1 by 1, and does not change the utility of any other agent. We compute a lower bound on d'_k in two cases.

Case 1: $z_k \leq z_1$. After the transfer, we have

$$d'_k = \frac{|A_k| - 1}{z_k} - w_k$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \frac{|A_k \cap Z_{k-1}| - 1}{z_k} - w_k \\
&> \frac{w_k z_{k-1} - 1}{z_k} - w_k \qquad \text{since there is an edge } (k-1) \rightarrow k.
\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma C.12, we have $z_1 < \dots < z_{k-1}$, so the above implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
d'_k &> \frac{w_k z_1 - 1}{z_k} - w_k \\
&= w_k z_1 \left(\frac{1}{z_k} - \frac{1}{z_1} \right) - \frac{1}{z_k} \\
&= w_k z_1 \left(\frac{1}{z_k} - \frac{1}{z_1} \right) - \frac{1}{z_1} - \left(\frac{1}{z_k} - \frac{1}{z_1} \right) \\
&= (w_k z_1 - 1) \left(\frac{1}{z_k} - \frac{1}{z_1} \right) - \frac{1}{z_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $z_k \leq z_1$, it holds that $1/z_k - 1/z_1 \geq 0$. If $w_k z_1 - 1 \geq 0$ too, then the above inequality implies $d'_k > -1/z_1$. Else, $w_k z_1 - 1 < 0$, and regardless of the above inequality we have $d'_k = |A'_k|/z_k - w_k \geq 0 - w_k > -1/z_1$.

Case 2: $z_k > z_1$. After the transfer, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d'_k &= \frac{a_k - 1}{z_k} - w_k \\
&= \frac{a_k - w_k z_k - 1}{z_k} \\
&\geq \frac{0 - 1}{z_k} \qquad a_k \geq w_k z_k, \text{ since there are no outgoing edges from } k. \\
&> -1/z_1 \qquad \text{since } z_k > z_1.
\end{aligned}$$

In both cases, the transfer strictly improves the leximin vector, a contradiction. □

Corollary C.15. *With binary valuations, every WEG allocation is APS-fair and OMMS-fair.*