

On the Complexity of Maximizing Social Welfare within Fair Allocations of Indivisible Goods

Xiaolin Bu¹, Zihao Li², Shengxin Liu³, Jiaxin Song⁴, and Biaoshuai Tao⁵

¹Shanghai Jiao Tong University, lin_bu@sjtu.edu.cn

²Nanyang Technological University, zihao004@e.ntu.edu.sg

³Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, sxliu@hit.edu.cn

⁴Shanghai Jiao Tong University, sjtu_xiaosong@sjtu.edu.cn

⁵Shanghai Jiao Tong University, bstao@sjtu.edu.cn

Abstract

Fair division is a classical topic studied in various disciplines and captures many real applications. One important issue in fair division is to cope with (economic) efficiency and fairness. A natural question along this direction that receives considerable attention is: How to obtain the most efficient allocations among all the fair allocations? In this paper, we study the complexity of maximizing social welfare within envy-free up to one item (EF1) allocations of indivisible goods for both normalized and unnormalized valuations. With two agents, we show a fully polynomial time approximation scheme (FPTAS) and complement this positive result with the NP-hardness result where the latter resolves an open problem raised by the previous work. Further, when the number of agents n is a constant, we provide a bi-criteria algorithm that finds the optimal social welfare while relaxing EF1 by a factor arbitrarily close to 1. We complement this by providing several strong inapproximability results if EF1 is not allowed to relax. In particular, we demonstrate that the inapproximability becomes stronger as n increases. Last, we consider the case with general number of agents. In this case, we give a variant of the round-robin algorithm with an approximation ratio of $1/n$ for unnormalized valuations and provide inapproximability results of $n^{1/3-\epsilon}$ and $m^{1/2-\epsilon}$ for normalized valuations. In addition, we show that our results of bi-criteria optimization for constant n cannot be extended to the setting here, unless $P = NP$.

1 Introduction

Fair division is a classical topic studied in economics, social science and computer science, and has garnered immense attention due to its wide applications (e.g., school choices [Abdulkadiroğlu et al., 2005], course allocations [Budish and Cantillon, 2012], paper review assignments [Lian et al., 2018], allocating computational resources [Ghodsi et al., 2011], etc.). Generally speaking, fair division studies how to fairly allocate a given set of resources to agents with respect to their heterogeneous preferences. Among all the fair allocations, an optimal allocation is naturally defined as the one with maximum *efficiency* (a.k.a. social welfare). The problem of finding such an optimal allocation has been well-studied in the *cake-cutting* literature where resources are (infinitely) divisible [Aumann and Dombb, 2015, Aumann et al., 2013, Brams et al., 2012, Caragiannis et al., 2012, Cohler et al., 2011, Bei et al., 2012]. However, much less attention for this problem has been received for *indivisible items*. In this paper, we study the computational complexity and approximability of this problem.

For different application scenarios, multiple notions of fairness have been defined to incorporate with agents' heterogeneous preferences. Among them, *envy-freeness* (EF) is arguably the most natural fairness criterion, which states that each agent values her own bundle at least as much as the bundle allocated to any other agent. In other words, each agent does not envy any other agent in the allocation. Other common fairness criteria include *proportionality* (PROP), *equitability* (EQ), etc (see, e.g., [Brams and Taylor, 1996, Brandt et al., 2016, Endriss, 2017, Moulin, 2019] for a survey).

Table 1: Known (positive and negative) results of social welfare maximization.

n	Utility	Positive Results	Negative Results
2	Normalized	FPTAS (Sec 3.1)	NP-hard (Thm 3.7)
	Unnormalized	FPTAS (Sec 3.1)	NP-hard (Thm 3.7, [Aziz et al., 2020])
Constant, ≥ 3	Normalized	$\approx \frac{1}{12\sqrt{n}}$ [Barman et al., 2020]	$10/n^{\frac{1}{7}}$ (Thm 4.6), $\frac{3n+1}{4n}$ (Thm 4.5)
	Unnormalized	$(1, 1 - \varepsilon)$ -BC (Sec 4.1)	$1/\lfloor \frac{1+\sqrt{4n-3}}{2} \rfloor$ (Thm 4.7)
General	Normalized	$\Omega(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$ [Barman et al., 2020]	$1/n^{\frac{1}{3}-\varepsilon}$, $1/m^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}$ (Thm 5.1)
	Unnormalized	$\frac{1}{n}$ (Thm 5.6)	$1/m^{1-\varepsilon}$ [Barman et al., 2019] $(1/n^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}, \varepsilon)$ -BC, $(1/m^{1-\varepsilon}, \varepsilon)$ -BC (Thm 5.4)

* n and m represent the numbers of agents and items respectively.

* (α, β) -BC: bi-criteria optimization with α -approximation on social welfare and β -approximate EF1 (Definition 4.1).

However, exact fairness may not be achievable for allocating indivisible items (e.g., when the number of items is less than the number of agents). The most common approach to relax exact fairness in indivisible resource allocation is *fairness up to one item*. Corresponding to envy-freeness, Budish [2011] considered *envy-freeness up to one item* (EF1), which requires that, for any pair of agents i and j , i does not envy j if an item from j 's allocated bundle is removed. Significant attention has been received for EF1 allocations since then, together with other criteria such as PROP1 and EQ1 which adapt PROP and EQ to the indivisible resource setting in the same ‘‘fairness up to one item’’ favor (see [Conitzer et al., 2017, Gourvès et al., 2014, Freeman et al., 2019]).

The above-mentioned relaxed notions of fairness are known to be achievable for allocating indivisible items [Lipton et al., 2004, Gourvès et al., 2014, Conitzer et al., 2017]. The next straightforward step is to optimize the allocation efficiency with a certain achievable fairness notion guaranteed. A natural measurement of efficiency is the *social welfare*—the sum of all the agents’ utilities for the allocation. The problem of maximizing efficiency within fair allocations can therefore be formulated as a *constrained optimization* problem. Unfortunately, compared with other domains, this problem is still much less understood in the context of indivisible item allocations.

Some recent works (e.g., [Aziz et al., 2020, Barman et al., 2020, 2019]) studied the computational complexity of finding the optimal social welfare subject to various fairness constraints including EF1 and PROP1, or the computational complexity of deciding whether there exists an allocation that maximizing social welfare (without subjecting to a fairness constraint) while being fair (see Section 1.2 for details). However, these papers mostly deal with *exact* optimal social welfare. The design of *approximation algorithms* and the study of *approximability* for this constrained optimization problem are mostly absent from the previous literature.

1.1 Our Results

We study the complexity, specifically, the approximability, of the problem of optimizing social welfare subject to the EF1 constraint. We give a landscape for the approximability of this constrained optimization problem. Our results are summarized based on different numbers of agents (see Table 1).

We first consider the case with two agents in Sect. 3. We give a fully polynomial-time approximation scheme (FPTAS) which gives a $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation to the optimal social welfare with running time bounded by a polynomial in the number of items and $1/\varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is an adjustable parameter. This is complemented by an NP-hardness result which holds even for the special case with normalized valuations (in normalized valuations, all agents have the same value on the set of all items), and this result resolves an open problem raised by Aziz et al. [2020].

Sect. 4 considers the case of n agents with $n > 2$ being a constant. We present a bi-criteria approximation algorithm that finds an allocation with the optimal social welfare while EF1 is only violated by a multiplicative factor of $(1 - \varepsilon)$. The algorithm’s running time is polynomial in terms of the problem’s input size and $1/\varepsilon$ for the adjustable parameter ε . On the other hand, if EF1 needs to be satisfied exactly, the approximability of social welfare changes dramatically. We present a family of the NP-hardness of approximation results (see Table 1 for details). In particular, the inapproximability factors grow as n grows, even with normalized valuations.

In Sect. 5, for general number of agents n that is given as input, we show that the problem admits polynomial inapproximability factors even with normalized valuations. In addition, for unnormalized valuations, we prove that even bi-criteria approximation algorithms are impossible assuming $P \neq NP$.

1.2 Related Work

The study of efficient and fair allocation in the context of divisible resources or indivisible resources is extensive [Aumann and Dombb, 2015, Aumann et al., 2013, Segal-Halevi and Sziklai, 2019, Caragiannis et al., 2016, Barman et al., 2018, Murhekar and Garg, 2021]. Several work considered the problem of maximizing social welfare within fair allocations, which is the focus of this paper. In the setting of divisible goods, the complexity of the problem is well understood [Cohler et al., 2011, Brams et al., 2012]. Specifically, maximizing social welfare within EF/PROP allocations for piecewise-constant valuations can both be solved optimally [Cohler et al., 2011]. However, if each agent is required to receive a connected piece of cake, this problem admits a polynomial inapproximability factor [Bei et al., 2012].

On the other hand, there are some recent works that consider the problem of maximizing social welfare within EF1 allocations for the indivisible goods. Barman et al. [2019] proved that the problem is NP-hard for 2 agents even when the valuations of one agent is the scaled version of the other (Theorem 4), and the problem is NP-hard to approximate to within a factor of $1/m^{1-\varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ for general numbers of agents n and items m (Theorem 5). They also presented a $\frac{1}{2}$ -approximation algorithm for this problem with the dominant-strategy incentive-compatible (DSIC) property, but this result is under the special setting where all agents' valuations are scaled versions of a single valuation function (which is named as "single-parameter setting"). Aziz et al. [2020] showed that the problem is still NP-hard for $n \geq 3$ even when the utility function is normalized, and left it an open problem for the case when $n = 2$. In addition, they proposed a pseudo polynomial-time algorithm when the number of agents is fixed. Barman et al. [2020] considered the price of fairness and showed that the price of EF1 is $O(\sqrt{n})$ for normalized valuations (this is asymptotically tight, as Bei et al. [2021b] showed that the price of EF1 is $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$), which implies an $\Omega(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$ -approximation algorithm. As we mentioned before, most of the previous work focuses on exact optimal social welfare, not on its approximability (with the two exceptions of the $1/m^{1-\varepsilon}$ inapproximability and the $\Omega(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$ -approximation algorithm mentioned just now). A complete landscape of the approximability for this constrained optimization problem is still missing before this paper.

2 Preliminaries

Let $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Denote by $N = [n]$ the set of agents and $M = [m]$ the set of indivisible items. Each agent i has a nonnegative *utility function* $v_i : \{0, 1\}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. We assume each agent's utility function is *additive*: $v_i(S) = \sum_{g \in S} v_i(\{g\})$ for every $i \in N$ and $S \subseteq M$, and we denote $v_i(\{g\})$ by v_{ig} or $v_i(g)$ for notation simplicity. Further, a utility function v_i is said to be *normalized* if $v_i(M) = \sum_{g \in M} v_{ig} = 1$, i.e., agent i values exactly 1 for the set of indivisible items M .

An *allocation* of the items $\mathcal{A} = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)$ is a partition of M , where A_i is the bundle of items allocated to agent i . An allocation is *envy-free* if $v_i(A_i) \geq v_i(A_j)$ for any two agents i and j in N . That is, according to agent i 's utility function, agent i does not envy any other agent j 's allocation. An envy-free allocation may not exist in the problem of allocating indivisible items (e.g., when $m < n$). We consider a well-known common relaxation of envy-freeness, *envy-freeness up to one item* (EF1), defined below.

Definition 2.1. An allocation $\mathcal{A} = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)$ is said to satisfy *envy-freeness up to one item* (EF1), if for any two agents i and j , there exists an item $g \in A_j$ such that $v_i(A_i) \geq v_i(A_j \setminus \{g\})$.

For a verbal description, in an EF1 allocation, after removing some item g from agent j 's bundle, agent i will no longer envy agent j . Given an allocation (A_1, \dots, A_n) , we say that agent i *envies* agent j if $v_i(A_i) < v_i(A_j)$, and we say that agent i *strongly envies* agent j if $v_i(A_i) < v_i(A_j \setminus \{g\})$ for every $g \in A_j$. By our definition, an allocation is EF1 if and only if i does not strongly envy j for every pair (i, j) of agents. It is well-known that an EF1 allocation always exists even for general utility functions, and it can be computed in polynomial time [Lipton et al., 2004, Budish, 2011].

Another important issue is economic efficiency, where we consider *social welfare* as defined below.

Algorithm 1: An FPTAS for maximizing social welfare subject to EF1

Input: two utility functions v_1 and v_2 , and the parameter $\varepsilon > 0$

Output: an EF1 allocation

```
1 Let  $O_1 \triangleq \{p \in [m] \mid v_{1p} \geq v_{2p}\}$  and  $O_2 \triangleq \{q \in [m] \mid v_{1q} < v_{2q}\}$ ;  
2 Let  $\Pi \leftarrow \emptyset$  be the set of all the candidate allocations;  
3 for each item  $g \in O_1$  do  
4   for each item  $o \in O_1 \setminus \{g\}$  do  
5      $v(o) \leftarrow v_{1o} - v_{2o}$  and  $w(o) \leftarrow v_{2o}$ ;  
6     Run the classic FPTAS with parameter  $\varepsilon$  for Knapsack with item set  $[m] \setminus (O_2 \cup \{g\})$ , value  
       function  $v$ , weight function  $w$  and capacity constraint  $\frac{v_2([m]) - v_{2g}}{2}$ , and let  $A'_1$  be the output;  
7     Let  $A'_2 = [m] \setminus (A'_1 \cup \{g\})$ ;  
8     if agent 1 strongly envies agent 2 in allocation  $(A'_1 \cup \{g\}, A'_2)$  then  
9        $(A_1, A_2) \leftarrow \text{LOCALSEARCH}(A'_1 \cup \{g\}, A'_2)$ ; // See Algorithm 2  
10     $\Pi \leftarrow \Pi \cup \{(A_1, A_2)\}$ ;  
11 return the allocation with the largest social welfare in  $\Pi$ 
```

Definition 2.2. The *social welfare* of an allocation $\mathcal{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_n)$, denoted by $\mathcal{SW}(\mathcal{A})$, is the sum of the utilities of all the agents $\mathcal{SW}(\mathcal{A}) = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i(A_i)$.

In this paper, we focus on the problem of maximizing social welfare subject to the EF1 constraint. More formally, we have the following constrained optimization problem.

Problem 1 (MSWWITHINEF1). Given a set of indivisible items $M = [m]$ and a set of agents $N = [n]$ with their utility functions (v_1, \dots, v_n) , the problem of *maximizing social welfare within EF1 allocations* (MSWWITHINEF1) aims to find an allocation $\mathcal{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_n)$ that maximizes social welfare $\mathcal{SW}(\mathcal{A})$ subject to that \mathcal{A} is EF1.

3 Maximizing Social Welfare with Two Agents

This section focuses MSWWITHINEF1 with two agents. We begin by presenting a fully polynomial-time approximation scheme (FPTAS) with two agents, and then complement this positive result by proving that MSWWITHINEF1 is NP-hard. Notice that our FPTAS is applicable to unnormalized valuations, and our NP-hardness result holds even for normalized valuations. In addition, the NP-hardness result for normalized valuations resolves the open problem raised by Aziz et al. [2020].

3.1 A Fully Polynomial-Time Approximation Scheme for Two Agents

In this part, we present our FPTAS for two agents. We will first handle the easy case where the exact optimal social welfare can be easily computed, without the need of an FPTAS. Next, we will exclusively handle the hard case in the remaining part of this section, where the FPTAS is presented.

Easy case. Consider the allocation (O_1, O_2) that maximizes social welfare without the EF1 constraint, where $O_1 \triangleq \{p \in [m] \mid v_{1p} \geq v_{2p}\}$ and $O_2 \triangleq \{q \in [m] \mid v_{1q} < v_{2q}\}$. If the two agents do not strongly envy each other, the allocation is already EF1, and we have solved MSWWITHINEF1.

Hard case. After handling the easy case, we will assume (O_1, O_2) is not EF1. Without loss of generality, we make the following assumption in the remaining part of this section.

Assumption 3.1. In the allocation (O_1, O_2) , agent 2 strongly envies agent 1.

The FPTAS is shown in Algorithm 1 and works as follows. The bundle O_2 is fixed to be given to agent 2 and an item $g \in O_1$ is fixed to be given to agent 1. This item g will be the item in Definition 2.1

Algorithm 2: The local search subroutine

```
1 Function LOCALSEARCH( $A_1, A_2$ ):
2   while agent 1 strongly envies agent 2 do
3     Find an arbitrary item  $g \in A_2 \setminus O_2$  and  $A_2 \leftarrow A_2 \setminus \{g\}$ ;
4     if agent 2 envies agent 1 under the partial allocation  $(A_1, A_2)$  then
5        $(A_1, A_2) \leftarrow (A_2 \cup \{g\}, A_1)$ ;
6     else
7        $(A_1, A_2) \leftarrow (A_1 \cup \{g\}, A_2)$ ;
8   return  $(A_1, A_2)$ 
```

whose removal ensures agent 2 does not envy agent 1, and we will enumerate all possibilities of $g \in O_1$. Next, we decide the allocation of the remaining items. To ensure agent 2 does not envy agent 1 after removing g from agent 1's bundle, the allocation (A_1, A_2) must satisfy $v_2(A_1 \setminus \{g\}) \leq v_2(A_2)$, which is equivalent to $v_2(A_1 \setminus \{g\}) \leq \frac{1}{2}v_2([m] \setminus \{g\})$. Therefore, the problem can be viewed as a classical Knapsack problem, where the capacity of the knapsack is $\frac{1}{2}v_2([m] \setminus \{g\})$, the weight of item o is v_{2o} , and the value is $v_{1o} - v_{2o}$. We then use the well-known FPTAS algorithm for the Knapsack problem (see, e.g., Chapter 8 in the textbook [Vazirani, 2001]). After this step, we have an allocation with almost optimal social welfare while ensuring agent 2 does not strongly envy agent 1. However, agent 1 may envy agent 2. If so, we use a local search algorithm (Algorithm 2) to make the allocation EF1 with an improved social welfare.

Theorem 3.2. *Algorithm 1 is an FPTAS for MSWWITHINEF1 with two agents.*

Before proving Theorem 3.2, we will define some additional notations. Let C_1 denote the constraint that agent 1 does not strongly envy agent 2 and C_2 denote the constraint that agent 2 does not strongly envy agent 1. Let OPT be the optimal social welfare under the EF1 constraint and $\text{OPT}(C_2)$ be the optimal social welfare subject to only C_2 . Let ALG be the social welfare of the allocation (A_1, A_2) output by Algorithm 1.

First of all, Assumption 3.1 immediately implies the following proposition. (Notice that, if agent 1 envies agent 2, by Assumption 3.1, the allocation (O_2, O_1) has a higher social welfare, which contradicts to that the allocation (O_1, O_2) maximizes social welfare.)

Proposition 3.3. *In the allocation (O_1, O_2) , agent 1 does not envy agent 2.*

Naturally, we have $\text{OPT} \leq \text{OPT}(C_2)$, as the additional constraints C_1 in OPT can only possibly reduce the optimal social welfare. The lemma below shows that the equality is achieved. In other words, among all the allocations that maximizes the social welfare subject to C_2 , there exists one that satisfies C_1 as well (and is thus EF1).

Lemma 3.4. $\text{OPT} = \text{OPT}(C_2)$.

Proof. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that every allocation satisfying C_2 with social welfare $\text{OPT}(C_2)$ does not satisfy C_1 . Let (A_1, A_2) be such an allocation among those that agent 1 envies agent 2 the least, i.e., with $v_1(A_2) - v_1(A_1)$ minimized. Firstly, agent 2's bundle A_2 contains at least one item g in O_1 , since otherwise agent 1 will not envy agent 2 if $O_1 \subseteq A_1$ (by Proposition 3.3).

We consider the partial allocation $(A_1, A_2 \setminus \{g\})$. Agent 1 will still envy agent 2 under this partial allocation, for otherwise, (s)he will not strongly envy agent 2 in (A_1, A_2) . We then discuss whether agent 2 envies agent 1 or not in the partial allocation $(A_1, A_2 \setminus \{g\})$.

Case 1: agent 2 envies agent 1. If we exchange the two bundles, the social welfare will increase and both of them will not envy each other. We further give item g to agent 1, and consider the allocation (A_2, A_1) . It is easy to see (A_2, A_1) has a higher social welfare (exchanging A_1 and $A_2 \setminus \{g\}$ increases the social welfare, and the reallocation of item g from agent 2 to agent 1 weakly increases the social welfare by our definition of the set O_1 where g belongs to) and constraint C_2 is still satisfied (agent 2 does not envy agent 1 after the exchange, so (s)he does not strongly envy agent 1 if g is additionally given to 1). This violates the assumption that $\text{OPT}(C_2)$ maximizes social welfare.

Case 2: agent 2 does not envy agent 1. Then, the allocation $(A_1 \cup \{g\}, A_2 \setminus \{g\})$ has a weakly higher social welfare (since $g \in O_1$) while C_2 still satisfies. It violates our assumption that (A_1, A_2) minimizes the amount of envy, as we are able to reallocate item g from agent 2 to agent 1 while still keeping social welfare being optimal subject to C_2 . \square

The following lemma shows the correctness of the local search algorithm (Algorithm 2).

Lemma 3.5. *Algorithm 2 outputs an EF1 allocation (A_1^o, A_2^o) that has a weakly higher social welfare than that of the input (A_1^i, A_2^i) , and it terminates after at most m while-loop iterations.*

Proof. The first paragraph in the proof of Lemma 3.4 shows the existence of item g at Line 3 of Algorithm 2. The analysis of the two cases in the proof of Lemma 3.4 shows that the social welfare weakly increases after each while-loop iteration. It remains to show that the while-loop terminates after at most m iterations.

In Case 1 that agent 2 envies agent 1 after removing g , the algorithm terminates immediately after exchanging two agents' bundles. Although the algorithm may not terminate immediately in Case 2, we observe that the size of A_1 is increased by 1 in each iteration corresponding to Case 2. If Case 1 happens after many iterations corresponding to Case 2, we know the algorithm will terminate after one more iteration. The increasing size of A_1 ensures that the algorithm terminates after at most m iterations in this scenario. If Case 1 never happen, then the algorithm will terminate with an EF1 allocation: Proposition 3.3 ensures agent 1 will not envy agent 2 at some stage when more and more items in O_1 are added to A_1 . Again, the increasing size of A_1 ensures that the algorithm terminates after at most m iterations in this scenario. \square

The following lemma proves the approximation guarantee for Algorithm 1.

Lemma 3.6. $\text{ALG} \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \text{OPT}$.

Proof. Let (S_1, S_2) be an allocation corresponding to both OPT and $\text{OPT}(C_2)$ (see Lemma 3.4). Firstly, it is easy to see that $O_2 \subseteq S_2$, and so $S_1 \subseteq O_1$. Otherwise, if an item in O_2 is allocated to agent 1, reallocating this item to agent 2 strictly increases the social welfare while C_2 is still satisfied.

Since (S_1, S_2) is EF1, there exists $g \in S_1$ such that $v_2(S_2) \geq v_2(S_1 \setminus \{g\})$. For each $o \in O_1$, let $v(o) = v_{1o} - v_{2o}$ as it is in Line 5 of Algorithm 1. We can write OPT and $\text{OPT}(C_2)$ as

$$\text{OPT} = \text{OPT}(C_2) = \sum_{o \in S_1} v_{1o} + \sum_{o \in S_2} v_{2o} = \sum_{o \in S_1} v(o) + \sum_{o=1}^n v_{2o} = v_2([m]) + v(g) + \sum_{o \in S_1 \setminus \{g\}} v(o).$$

Consider the for-loop iteration at Line 3 where item g is in consideration. Since $v_2(S_2) \geq v_2(S_1 \setminus \{g\})$, we have $\sum_{o \in S_1 \setminus \{g\}} v_{2o} \leq \frac{1}{2}(v_2([m]) - v_2(g))$, so $S_1 \setminus \{g\} \subseteq O_1$ is a valid solution to the Knapsack problem at Line 6. By the nature of FPTAS, A'_1 output at Line 6 must satisfy $\sum_{o \in A'_1} v(o) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \sum_{o \in S_1 \setminus \{g\}} v(o)$. The social welfare for the allocation $(A'_1 \cup \{g\}, A'_2)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SW}(A'_1 \cup \{g\}, A'_2) &= \sum_{o \in A'_1 \cup \{g\}} v_{1o} + \sum_{o \in A'_2} v_{2o} = \sum_{o \in A'_1 \cup \{g\}} v(o) + \sum_{o=1}^n v_{2o} \\ &= v_2([m]) + v(g) + \sum_{o \in A'_1} v(o) \geq v_2([m]) + v(g) + (1 - \varepsilon) \sum_{o \in S_1 \setminus \{g\}} v(o) > (1 - \varepsilon) \text{OPT}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, Lemma 3.5 and our choice of the allocation with the largest social welfare (Line 11) ensure that the final allocation of Algorithm 1 has a social welfare that is at least $\text{SW}(A'_1 \cup \{g\}, A'_2)$. \square

With the approximation guarantee proved in Lemma 3.6, Theorem 3.2 holds straightforwardly as it is easy to verify that the algorithm's running time is polynomial in m and $1/\varepsilon$. The only non-trivial part of the time complexity analysis is the running time for the local search, which is analyzed in lemma 3.5.

3.2 NP-Hardness for Two Agents with Normalized Valuations

We complement our positive result with the following NP-hardness result. Aziz et al. [2020] showed the NP-hardness of MSWWITHINEF1 with two agents. However, their result only applies to the setting with unnormalized valuations. They also raised the corresponding problem with normalized valuations as an open problem which is resolved by our result below.

Theorem 3.7. *MSWWITHINEF1 is NP-hard for $n = 2$ even under normalized valuations.*

Proof. We show a reduction from the partition problem. Fix a partition instance $S = \{e_1, \dots, e_\ell\}$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} e_i = 2x \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Without loss of generality, we can assume $x = 1$, and we construct an instance as shown in the table below, where $C \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is a sufficiently large number. Note that though $\sum_{o \in [m]} v_1(o)$ and $\sum_{o \in [m]} v_2(o)$ are not normalized, they are both equal to $2C + 2$ and can be rescaled to 1. Therefore, the normalization assumption is not violated.

item	k ($1 \leq k \leq \ell$)	$\ell + 1$	$\ell + 2$	$\ell + 3$
v_1	e_k	C	C	0
v_2	$e_k/2$	$(2C + 1)/3$	$(2C + 1)/3$	$(2C + 1)/3$

If the partition instance is a yes-instance, suppose $A_1 \subseteq [\ell]$ and $A_2 \subseteq [\ell]$ correspond to the partition (S_1, S_2) of S with equal sum. It is not hard to verify that the allocation $\mathcal{A} = (A_1 \cup \{\ell + 1, \ell + 2\}, A_2 \cup \{\ell + 3\})$ satisfies EF1, and $\mathcal{SW}(\mathcal{A}) = (16C + 11)/6$.

If the partition instance is a no-instance, we show that the maximum social welfare is less than $(16C + 11)/6$. If there exists an allocation \mathcal{A}' with social welfare of at least $(16C + 11)/6$, then it is easy to see that $\ell + 1$ and $\ell + 2$ must be given to agent 1 and $\ell + 3$ must be given to agent 2. Since $\mathcal{SW}(\mathcal{A}') \geq (16C + 11)/6$, agent 1 should take a bundle $O_1 \subseteq [\ell]$ with at least half of the value of the first ℓ items. Due to the EF1 constraint, agent 2 should also take a bundle $O_2 \subseteq [\ell]$ with at least half of the value of the first ℓ items. This would imply the partition instance is a yes-instance, which contradicts to our assumption. \square

4 Maximizing Social Welfare with Constant Number of Agents

For constant n , we consider a bi-criteria algorithm followed by inapproximability results.

4.1 Bi-Criteria Optimization

This part considers a bi-criteria optimization version of MSWWITHINEF1, where the EF1 constraint is relaxed in the following natural way.

Definition 4.1. Given a real number $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, an allocation is α -approximate EF1, if for any two agents i and j , there exists an item $g \in A_j$ such that $v_i(A_i) \geq \alpha \cdot v_i(A_j \setminus \{g\})$.

We will describe an algorithm that can find the allocation with the largest social welfare but with an $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation to the EF1 constraint. This is in sharp contrast to our inapproximability results in the next section.

Aziz et al. [2020] provide a pseudo-polynomial time algorithm for MSWWITHINEF1 with a constant number of agents. One may expect that standard rounding techniques can achieve the above-mentioned bi-criteria optimization. However, straightforward rounding techniques fail. It is possible that an agent's valuations to all items are extremely small, so that significant loss of precision occurs after rounding. An EF1 allocation in the rounded instance may be very far from being EF1 in the original instance. To achieve bi-criteria optimization, we will use a careful individualized rounding together with some other extra techniques.

Theorem 4.2. *Fix an arbitrary value of algorithm parameter $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists an algorithm that computes an allocation \mathcal{A} such that \mathcal{A} is $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximate EF1 and $\mathcal{SW}(\mathcal{A}) \geq \mathcal{SW}(\mathcal{A}^*)$, where \mathcal{A}^* is an EF1 allocation that maximizes social welfare. In addition, the algorithm's running time is polynomial in terms of m and $1/\varepsilon$ when the number of agents n is a constant.*

Theorem 4.2. *Fix an arbitrary value of algorithm parameter $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists an algorithm that computes an allocation \mathcal{A} such that \mathcal{A} is $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximate EF1 and $SW(\mathcal{A}) \geq SW(\mathcal{A}^*)$, where \mathcal{A}^* is an EF1 allocation that maximizes social welfare. In addition, the algorithm's running time is polynomial in terms of m and $1/\varepsilon$ when the number of agents n is a constant.*

Before we prove Theorem 4.2, we first describe our algorithms. We will first show our high level designs, and then give the complete algorithms (shown in Algorithm 3 and Algorithm 4). The high level ideas of our algorithm are here.

The algorithm proceeds in three steps. In the first step, we fix some items in each agent's bundle. In particular, for each pair of agents i and j , we fix an item g_{ij} in agent i 's bundle A_i . This item will be the item g in Definition 2.1 such that, after removing it from A_i , agent j will not envy agent i . The first step will enumerate all possible sets for $\{g_{ij}\}$. In the second step, we will apply an individualized rounding technique so that each agent's valuations to all the *remaining items that are not fixed in the first step* can only take values from a set of numbers whose cardinality is polynomial in m and $1/\varepsilon$. In the third step, we will use a dynamic programming method to solve our problem. It is crucial that the first two steps cannot be swapped. We will see the reason later.

Step 1: items fixing. For each agent i , we fix $X_i = \{g_{i1}, g_{i2}, \dots, g_{i(i-1)}, g_{i(i+1)}, \dots, g_{in}\}$ with $X_i \subseteq A_i$. For each g_{ij} , it is expected that agent j does not envy agent i after removing g_{ij} . Notice that it is possible that $g_{ij_1} = g_{ij_2}$. We enumerate all possible sets for $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$. For each fixed $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$, we proceed to Step 2 and 3 and compute the remaining part of the allocation. Notice that the total number of the sets is at most $m^{n(n-1)}$ (each g_{ij} can be one of the m items), and this is a polynomial of m given that n is a constant.

Step 2: individualized rounding. We first fix an adjustable precision parameter K that is a polynomial of m and $1/\varepsilon$. Let $Y_i = \{g_{1i}, \dots, g_{(i-1)i}, g_{(i+1)i}, \dots, g_{ni}\}$. Notice that, for agent i , each item in Y_i has been fixed to another agent. Let $V_i = v_i([m] \setminus Y_i)$ be agent i 's total value for all the items that are not in Y_i . Let $\tau_i = V_i/K$. We will round down the valuations v_i of agent i to the items in $[m] \setminus Y_i$ such that the rounded valuations \bar{v}_i can only take values from $\{0, \tau_i, 2\tau_i, \dots, K\tau_i\}$. Notice that valuations of items in Y_i are not rounded, and they can be significantly larger than $K\tau_i$.

In the next step, we will solve one problem similar to MSWWITHINEF1 on the instance after the rounding process above, where we aim to find an allocation that maximizes social welfare in the original valuation subject to the EF1 constraint in the rounded valuation. To show that we can obtain an optimal social welfare with a nearly EF1 allocation, we need to achieve that 1) an EF1 allocation in the original instance is still EF1 in the rounded instance (so that no "high-quality" allocation with high social welfare is ruled out after rounding) and 2) an EF1 allocation in the rounded instance is approximate EF1 in the original instance. Notice that the EF1 here is in terms of the items g_{ij} fixed in Step 1.

To achieve 1), we add n dummy items d_1, \dots, d_n such that agent i has value $m\tau_i$ on item d_i and value 0 on the remaining $n - 1$ items. Each item d_i is allocated to agent i . If the allocation satisfies that $v_i(A_i) \geq v_i(A_j \setminus \{g_{ji}\})$ in the original instance, we must also have $\bar{v}_i(A_i \cup \{d_i\}) \geq \bar{v}_i(A_j \cup \{d_j\} \setminus \{g_{ji}\})$ in the rounded instance. This is because $v_i(A_i)$ can only be reduced by at most $m\tau_i$ after rounding. We can set K to be significantly larger than m such that the value of each dummy item is negligible.

To show 2), a crucial observation is that, in an allocation $\mathcal{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_n)$ (with the n dummy items added) that is EF1 in the rounded instance, we must have $\bar{v}_i(A_i) \geq \frac{1}{n}V_i$. Notice that agent i should not envy any other agent after removing the corresponding item in Y_i from the other agent's bundle. Therefore, agent i should receive at least the *average* value of $[m] \cup \{d_1, \dots, d_n\} \setminus Y_i$. Since the value of $[m] \cup \{d_1, \dots, d_n\} \setminus Y_i$ is at least V_i (notice that the value of $[m] \setminus Y_i$ is at least $V_i - m\tau_i$ after rounding), we have $\bar{v}_i(A_i) \geq \frac{1}{n}V_i$. Suppose, when considering \mathcal{A} in the original instance (with dummy items removed), agent i envies agent j even after removing g_{ji} from agent j 's bundle. We aim to show that the amount of envy is small compared with agent i 's value on j 's bundle (i.e., the amount of envy is an ε fraction of i 's value on j 's bundle). Firstly, since the allocation is EF1 in the rounded instance, the amount of envy in the original instance is at most $2m\tau_i$ ($m\tau_i$ for the dummy item, and at most $m\tau_i$ for the loss of the precision in the rounding). We can make this amount considerably smaller than $\frac{1}{n}V_i$ by setting K large enough. Secondly, agent i 's value on j 's

bundle (with g_{ji} removed) in the original instance should be at least $\frac{1}{n}V_i - 2m\tau_i \approx \frac{1}{n}V_i$ (in order to make i possibly envy j). The amount of envy, which is at most $2m\tau_i$, is indeed very small.

We now remark that Step 1 and Step 2 cannot be swapped. If Y_i is participated in the rounding, it is possible that items in Y_i have much larger values to agent i compared with the remaining items such that the remaining items have value 0 after rounding. In this case, $V_i = v_i([m] \setminus Y_i)$ may even be rounded to 0, and the amount of envy $m\tau_i$ can be large compared with agent i 's value on j 's bundle.

Step 3: dynamic programming. The remaining part of the algorithm is a standard dynamic program. Let $H[\{u_{ij}\}_{i=1,\dots,n;j=1,\dots,n}]$ be a Boolean function which takes n^2 values $\{u_{ij}\}$ as inputs and outputs TRUE if and only if there exists an allocation $\mathcal{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_n)$ such that $\bar{v}_i(A_j \setminus \{g_{ji}\}) = u_{ij}$. After the rounding and adding dummy items in Step 2, we can assume each u_{ij} only takes values from $\{0, \tau_i, 2\tau_i, \dots, (K+m)\tau_i\}$. In addition, the total number of possible inputs to $H[\cdot]$ is $(K+m+1)^{n^2}$, which is a polynomial in m and $1/\varepsilon$ (as K is a polynomial in m and $1/\varepsilon$, and n is a constant). We can use a standard dynamic program to evaluate $H[\cdot]$ for all inputs. We can check each of the corresponding allocations to see if it satisfies EF1, and find out the one with maximum social welfare. In addition, we can get the exact optimal social welfare instead of the $(1-\varepsilon)$ -approximation by comparing the social welfare of the stored allocations in terms of their actual values (instead of the rounded values).

Algorithm 3: Bi-criteria optimization of MSWWITHINEF1

Input: utility functions v_1, \dots, v_n , item set $M = [m]$, and the parameter $\varepsilon > 0$
Output: an $(1-\varepsilon)$ -approximate EF1 allocation.

- 1 set $K \leftarrow \lceil \frac{3mn}{\varepsilon} \rceil$;
- 2 initialize $\Pi \leftarrow \emptyset$;
- /* Π stores candidate allocations */
- 3 **for** each $X = \{X_i = \{g_{i1}, \dots, g_{i(i-1)}, g_{i(i+1)}, \dots, g_{in}\} \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ **do**
 - /* elements in X_i may be repeated, but $X_i \cap X_j = \emptyset$ for any i, j */
 - 4 **for** each $i = 1, \dots, n$ **do**
 - 5 set $Y_i \leftarrow \{g_{1i}, \dots, g_{(i-1)i}, g_{(i+1)i}, \dots, g_{ni}\}$;
 - 6 set $V_i \leftarrow v_i([m] \setminus Y_i)$;
 - 7 set $\tau_i \leftarrow V_i/K$;
 - 8 for each $o \in [m] \setminus Y_i$, set $\bar{v}_i(o) \leftarrow \max_{k:k\tau_i \leq v_i(o)} k\tau_i$;
 - 9 for each $o \in Y_i$, set $\bar{v}_i(o) \leftarrow 0$;
 - 10 add a new item d_i to M such that $\bar{v}_i(d_i) = m\tau_i$ and $\bar{v}_j(d_i) = 0$ for each $j \neq i$ and $v_j(d_i) = 0$
for each $j \in [n]$;
 - 11 $X_i \leftarrow X_i \cup d_i$;
 - 12 $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow \text{DYNAMICPROGRAM}(M, \bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_n, v_1, \dots, v_n, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_n, X, K)$; // see Algorithm 4
 - 13 include \mathcal{A} in Π ;
- 14 **return** the allocation in Π with the largest social welfare with respect to $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$

4.1.1 Proof of Theorem 4.2

In Algorithm 3, we set the precision parameter K as $\lceil \frac{3mn}{\varepsilon} \rceil$ which is a polynomial of m and $1/\varepsilon$. We enumerate all possible removing item set $X = \{X_i = \{g_{i1}, \dots, g_{i(i-1)}, g_{i(i+1)}, \dots, g_{in}\} \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ in Line 3, where each g_{ij} is expected that agent j will not envy agent i after removing g_{ij} in agent i 's bundle (**Step 1: items fixing**). Lines 6-8 perform the **individualized rounding** step and set the rounded valuation \bar{v}_i such that the valuations can only take values from $\{0, \tau_i, 2\tau_i, \dots, K\tau_i\}$. For convenience, for each agent i , Line 9 sets **the valuation of all items in Y_i as 0** so that we can turn the original EF1 condition with regard to Y_i to the envy-freeness condition.

Lines 10-11 add the dummy items $\{d_1, \dots, d_n\}$ to reach the goal that if the allocation satisfies that $v_i(A_i) \geq v_i(A_j \setminus \{g_{ji}\})$ in the original instance, we must also have $\bar{v}_i(A_i \cup \{d_i\}) \geq \bar{v}_i(A_j \cup \{d_j\})$, and update the fixed item set X_i for each agent i . Finally, Lines 12-14 call Algorithm 4 to find the optimal envy-free

Algorithm 4: The dynamic programming subroutine

```
1 Function DYNAMICPROGRAM( $M = [m + n], \bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_n, v_1, \dots, v_n, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_n, X, K$ ):
   /*  $X = \{X_i = \{g_{i1}, \dots, g_{i(i-1)}, g_{i(i+1)}, \dots, g_{in}, d_i\} \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$  */
   /* for each  $i$ , dummy item  $d_i$  is the  $(m + i)$ -th item */
   /* for each  $i$ ,  $\bar{v}_i(S)/\tau_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, K + m\}$  holds for any  $S \subseteq M$  */
2 for each  $\chi \in \{0, 1, \dots, K + m\}^{n^2}$  and each  $t = 0, 1, \dots, m + n$  do
3   | initialize  $H[\chi, t] \leftarrow \text{NIL}$ ;
4    $H[0^{n^2}, 0] \leftarrow 0$ ;
5   for each  $t = 0, \dots, m + n - 1$  do
6     | for each  $\chi$  in the dictionary ascending order such that  $H[\chi, t] \neq \text{NIL}$  do
7       | if item  $t + 1$  belongs to  $X$  then
8         | | suppose  $t \in X_{i^*}$ ;
9         | | UPDATE( $\chi, t, i^*$ );
10      | else
11      | | for each  $i = 1, \dots, n$  do
12      | | | UPDATE( $\chi, t, i$ );
13  for each  $\chi \in \{0, 1, \dots, K + m\}^{n^2}$  do
14  | set  $H[\chi, m + n] \leftarrow \text{NIL}$  if the allocation stored in  $H[\chi, m + n]$  is not envy-free w.r.t.  $\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_n$ ;
15  if  $H[\chi, m + n] \neq \text{NIL}$  for some  $\chi$  then
16  | return the allocation in  $\{H[\chi, m + n] \mid H[\chi, m + n] \neq \text{NIL}, \chi \in \{0, 1, \dots, K + m\}^{n^2}\}$  with the
17  | largest social welfare w.r.t.  $v_1, \dots, v_n$ , i.e. the one with the largest value  $H[\chi, m + n]$ 
18  else
19  | return NIL
19 Function UPDATE( $\chi, t, i$ ):
20 | for each  $j$ , set  $\chi'_{ji} \leftarrow \chi_{ji} + \bar{v}_j(t + 1)/\tau_j$ ;
21 | for each  $(i', j)$  with  $i' \neq i$ , set  $\chi'_{ji'} \leftarrow \chi_{ji}$ ;
22 if  $H[\chi', t + 1] == \text{NIL}$  or  $H[\chi', t + 1] < H[\chi, t] + v_i(t + 1)$  then
23 |  $H[\chi', t + 1] \leftarrow H[\chi, t] + v_i(t + 1)$ ;
```

allocation after fixing set X and return the one with the largest social welfare with respect to original valuation among all possible sets X .

For Algorithm 4, it uses the dynamic program to calculate the optimal envy-free allocation after fixing the assigned item set $X = \{X_i = \{g_{i1}, \dots, g_{i(i-1)}, g_{i(i+1)}, \dots, g_{in}, d_i\} \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$, where all items in X_i should be assigned to agent i (**Step 3: dynamic programming**). Since we add the dummy items, for any subset $S \subseteq M$, we have $\bar{v}_i(S)/\tau_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, K + m\}$ for each i . In this algorithm, we use the state $H[\chi, t]$ to store the maximum social welfare value with regard to the original valuation (and record the corresponding allocation simultaneously), where χ_{ij} represents the value of agent j 's bundle with regard to \bar{v}_i when allocating only the first t items.

Lines 2-4 initialize the values $H[\chi, t]$ for all possible χ and t . Lines 5-12 transfer the state, where Lines 7-9 is for the case where item $t + 1$ has been assigned to agent i before and Lines 10-12 is for the case where item $t + 1$ has not been assigned and we need to enumerate the allocated agent. Next, Lines 13-18 return the envy-free allocation with the largest social welfare with regard to original valuation. Lines 19-23 describe the detailed state transfer if we assign item $t + 1$ to agent i from the state $H[\chi, t]$.

After describing the algorithm formally, we now prove Theorem 4.2. The proof contains two parts:

- an EF1 allocation in the original instance can be transferred to an EF allocation in the modified instance (after rounding and adding dummy items).
- an EF allocation in the modified instance can be transferred to an $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximate EF1 allocation in the original instance.

We will use the following two lemmas to show these two points.

Lemma 4.3. *For an EF1 allocation $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ with regard to $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ in the original instance, the corresponding allocation $\mathcal{A}' = \{A'_1, \dots, A'_n\}$ where $A'_i = A_i \cup \{d_i\}$ for each i , is an EF allocation with regard to $\{\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_n\}$ after fixing some set $X = \{X_i = \{g_{i1}, \dots, g_{i(i-1)}, g_{i(i+1)}, \dots, g_{in}, d_i\} \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ in the modified instance.*

Proof. For an EF1 allocation $A = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ with regard to $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$, for each (i, j) where $i \neq j$, there exists one $g_{ji} \in A_j$ such that $v_i(A_i) \geq v_i(A_j \setminus \{g_{ji}\})$ by the definition of EF1. We use all these g_{ji} to get the set X . We want to show $\bar{v}_i(A_i \cup \{d_i\}) \geq \bar{v}_i(A_j \cup \{d_j\})$ for each (i, j) where $i \neq j$.

We consider each (i, j) where $i \neq j$. We have $\bar{v}_i(A_i \cup \{d_i\}) = \bar{v}_i(A_i) + m\tau_i \geq v_i(A_i) - m\tau_i + m\tau_i = v_i(A_i)$ because A_i contains at most m items and the value of each is rounded down by at most τ_i . On the other hand, since $g_{ji} \in Y_i$, we have $\bar{v}_i(g_{ji}) = 0$ by Line 9 of Algorithm 3. By EF1, $v_i(A_i)$ is at least $v_i(A_j \setminus \{g_{ji}\}) \geq \bar{v}_i(A_j \setminus \{g_{ji}\}) = \bar{v}_i(A_j) = \bar{v}_i(A_j \cup \{d_j\})$. Therefore, $\bar{v}_i(A_i \cup \{d_i\}) \geq \bar{v}_i(A_j \cup \{d_j\})$. \square

Lemma 4.4. *For an EF allocation $\mathcal{A}' = \{A'_1, \dots, A'_n\}$ where $A'_i = A_i \cup \{d_i\}$ for each i with regard to $\{\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_n\}$ after fixing the set $X = \{X_i = \{g_{i1}, \dots, g_{i(i-1)}, g_{i(i+1)}, \dots, g_{in}, d_i\} \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ in the modified instance, the corresponding allocation $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ is an $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximate EF1 allocation with regard to $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ in the original instance.*

Proof. By definition, for each pair (i, j) where $i \neq j$, we have $\bar{v}_i(A_i \cup \{d_i\}) \geq \bar{v}_i(A_j \cup \{d_j\})$, then it suffices to show $v_i(A_i) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)v_i(A_j \setminus \{g_{ji}\})$.

We consider each pair (i, j) where $i \neq j$ such that agent i envies agent j even after removing item g_{ji} from j 's bundle: $v_i(A_i) < v_i(A_j \setminus \{g_{ji}\})$ (otherwise, if no such pair exist, the allocation is EF1 and we are done). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
v_i(A_i) &\geq \bar{v}_i(A_i) && \text{(values of items are rounded down)} \\
&= \bar{v}_i(A_i \cup \{d_i\}) - m\tau_i && (\bar{v}_i(d_i) = m\tau_i) \\
&\geq \bar{v}_i(A_j \cup \{d_j\}) - m\tau_i && (\mathcal{A}' \text{ is envy-free}) \\
&= \bar{v}_i(A_j) - m\tau_i && (\bar{v}_i(d_j) = 0) \\
&= \bar{v}_i(A_j \setminus \{g_{ji}\}) - m\tau_i && (\bar{v}_i(g_{ji}) = 0 \text{ from } g_{ji} \in Y_i \text{ (Line 9 of Algorithm 3)}) \\
&\geq v_i(A_j \setminus \{g_{ji}\}) - 2m\tau_i,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is because $A_j \setminus \{g_{ji}\}$ contains at most m items and the value of each is rounded down by at most τ_i . Thus, if we can show $2m\tau_i \leq \varepsilon v_i(A_j \setminus \{g_{ji}\})$, then we have $v_i(A_i) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)v_i(A_j \setminus \{g_{ji}\})$, which finishes the proof.

So the remaining is to show $2m\tau_i \leq \varepsilon v_i(A_j \setminus \{g_{ji}\})$. Since we have $\bar{v}_i(A_i) + m\tau_i = \bar{v}_i(A_i \cup \{d_i\}) \geq \bar{v}_i(A_{j'} \cup \{d_{j'}\}) = \bar{v}_i(A_{j'} \setminus \{g_{j'i}\})$ for each $j' \neq i$, and we also have $\bar{v}_i(A_i) + m\tau_i \geq \bar{v}_i(A_i) + m\tau_i$, we sum all these n terms up and we have

$$\bar{v}_i(A_i) + m\tau_i \geq \frac{1}{n} \left(\bar{v}_i(A_i) + m\tau_i + \sum_{j' \neq i} \bar{v}_i(A_{j'} \setminus \{g_{j'i}\}) \right) = \frac{1}{n} (\bar{v}_i([m] \setminus Y_i) + m\tau_i) \geq \frac{1}{n} v_i([m] \setminus Y_i)$$

where the last inequality is due to that the value of each item is rounded down by at most τ_i and there are at most m items. Recalling that we have set $V_i = v_i([m] \setminus Y_i)$, this means $\bar{v}_i(A_i) \geq \frac{V_i}{n} - m\tau_i$.

Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon v_i(A_j \setminus \{g_{ji}\}) &> \varepsilon v_i(A_i) && \text{(we have assumed } v_i(A_i) < v_j(A_j \setminus \{g_{ji}\}) \text{ at the beginning)} \\ &\geq \varepsilon \bar{v}_i(A_i) \\ &\geq \varepsilon \left(\frac{V_i}{n} - m\tau_i \right) && \text{(we have just proved this)} \\ &\geq \varepsilon \frac{V_i}{n} - m\tau_i. \end{aligned}$$

To show $2m\tau_i \leq \varepsilon v_i(A_j \setminus \{g_{ji}\})$, it remains to show $\varepsilon \frac{V_i}{n} - m\tau_i \geq 2m\tau_i$, that is $\tau_i \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3mn} V_i$. Since $K = \lceil \frac{3mn}{\varepsilon} \rceil \geq \frac{3mn}{\varepsilon}$, we have $\tau_i = V_i/K \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3mn} V_i$, and the lemma concludes. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Assume the allocation $\mathcal{A}^* = (A_1, \dots, A_n)$ is the EF1 allocation with the largest social welfare, from Lemma 4.3, it can be transferred to one EF allocation $\mathcal{A}' = \{A'_1, \dots, A'_n\}$ where $A'_i = A_i \cup \{d_i\}$ for each i after fixing some set X . Then, since we choose the allocation with the largest social welfare with regard to original valuation for all possible sets X , the allocation output by Algorithm 3 must have at least the same social welfare with regard to original valuation after removing the dummy items. Furthermore, because of Lemma 4.4, this allocation is an $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximate EF1 allocation with regard to original valuation. To sum up, the output allocation \mathcal{A} should be $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximate EF1 and $\mathcal{SW}(\mathcal{A}) \geq \mathcal{SW}(\mathcal{A}^*)$. \square

4.2 Inapproximability Results for Constant Number of Agents

In this section, we present a family of inapproximability results. We will see that the inapproximability factor grows in a polynomial speed as n grows. Compared with the result in the last section, we see that the approximability of MSWWITHINEF1 is catastrophically reduced if we insist on exact EF1 instead of allowing $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximate EF1.

Theorem 4.5. *MSWWITHINEF1 is NP-hard to approximate to within factor $\frac{3n+1}{4n}$ for any fixed $n > 2$, even under normalized valuations.*

It should be mentioned that the factor $\frac{3n+1}{4n}$ above does not apply to $n = 2$. When substituting $n = 2$, the ratio is $7/8$. However, we gave an FPTAS in Section 3.1.

The inapproximability factor is lower-bounded by $3/4$ in Theorem 4.5. In the theorem below, we provide a much stronger inapproximability factor for larger n .

Theorem 4.6. *For any fixed $n > 10^7$, MSWWITHINEF1 is NP-hard to approximate to factor $\frac{10}{n^{1/7}}$.*

Proof. We will show a reduction from the partition problem. When given a partition instance $\{e_1, \dots, e_\ell\}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} e_i = 2x$, we construct an instance for problem 1 with n agents and $\ell + n - 1$ items as follows. For agent 1, (s)he has value $\frac{nx+x}{2}$ for the item $\ell + 1$ and $\ell + 2$, and value 0 for the remaining items. For agent 2 to agent n , they have value e_o for item $o \in [\ell]$ and value x for each of the remaining items. The values will sum up to $nx + x$ for all agents and it can be normalized to 1, which satisfies the definition of normalized valuations.




Figure 1: Agents and items of our construction when $n = 14$.

If the partition instance is a yes-instance, we assume the partition is (S_1, S_2) . Let agent 2 receive items corresponding to S_1 , agent 3 receive items corresponding to S_2 , each of the agents $4, \dots, n$ receive one of the items from item $\ell + 3$ to item $n + \ell - 1$, and all of them receive items with total value x in this case. Let agent 1 receive item $\ell + 1$ and item $\ell + 2$. The allocation is EF1 because agent 1 will not envy any other agent, and when removing one of the items in agent 1's bundle, other agents will not envy agent 1 either. The social welfare under this case is $2nx$.

If the partition instance is a no-instance, agent 1 can only receive one of item $t + 1$ and item $t + 2$. Otherwise, if agent 1 receives both items, all other agents should receive items that values sum up to at least x , which is impossible in a no partition instance. In this case, the social welfare will be at most $\frac{3nx+x}{2}$. Hence, the inapproximability factor is $\frac{3n+1}{4n}$ for any fixed $n > 2$.

4.3 Proof of Theorem 4.6

We will present a reduction from the partition problem. Fix a partition instance $S = \{e_1, \dots, e_\ell\}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} e_i = 2\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$, where ε is a very small number (with the partition instance rescaled). Let $t = \lceil n^{\frac{1}{7}} \rceil$, $k = \lfloor \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{4n}{t} - 3} \rfloor$, and $x = \frac{1+(t(k^2-k)-2)\varepsilon}{t(k^2-k)+2}$. We construct a fair division instance as follows. The construction is illustrated in Fig. 1 and Table 2 with $n = 14$ (so that $t = 2, k = 3, x = \frac{1+10\varepsilon}{14}$). Nodes with gray background represent items, and nodes without background represent agents.

When n is general, the items are divided into four categories: *clique items*, *partition items*, and *pool items*, *dummy items*.

- There are t groups of clique items (the i -th group is named \mathcal{C}_i). For each group, consider a clique $G = (V, E)$ with k vertices, each vertex in the clique corresponds to a clique item. The items in group \mathcal{C}_i are named $c_1^{(i)}, \dots, c_k^{(i)}$. As shown in Fig. 1, when $n = 14$, there are $t = 2$ clique item groups each of which contains $k = 3$ items.
- There are $t(k^2 - k)/2$ groups of partition items, which are denoted by $\mathcal{P}^{(i),\{u,v\}}$, $1 \leq i \leq t, 1 \leq u < v \leq k$. Each group corresponds to an edge ($\mathcal{P}^{(i),\{u,v\}}$ corresponds to the edge (u, v) in the i -th clique) and contains ℓ items, and those ℓ items, named as $p_1^{(i),\{u,v\}}, \dots, p_\ell^{(i),\{u,v\}}$, correspond to the ℓ numbers in the partition instance. For simplicity, we only display one of the six groups, $\mathcal{P}^{(1),\{1,3\}}$, in Fig. 1, and $p_1^{(1),\{1,3\}}, \dots, p_\ell^{(1),\{1,3\}}$ are the items contained in group $\mathcal{P}^{(1),\{1,3\}}$.
- There are $t(k^2 - k)$ pool items, denoted by q_i , $1 \leq i \leq t(k^2 - k)$. As shown in Fig. 1, there are 12 pool items, and they are denoted by q_1, \dots, q_{12} .
- There are also $n - t(k^2 - k + 1)$ dummy items. For the example with $n = 14$, since $14 - 2(3^2 - 3 + 1) = 0$, we do not draw any dummy item in Fig. 1.

The agents are also divided into three categories: *super agents*, *normal agents*, and *dummy agents*,

- There are t super agents named s_1, \dots, s_t corresponding to the t cliques.
- There are also t groups of normal agents corresponding to the t cliques, and each group contains $k^2 - k$ normal agents. For the i -th group, each edge (u, v) in the clique corresponds to two normal agents $a_{(u,v)}^{(i)}$ and $a_{(v,u)}^{(i)}$. For the example with $n = 14$, since there are 6 edges for the two cliques in Fig. 1, they correspond to 12 normal agents $a_{(u,v)}^{(1)}$ and $a_{(u,v)}^{(2)}$, $1 \leq u < v \leq 3$.
- There are also $n - t(k^2 - k + 1)$ dummy agents. For the example with $n = 14$, since $14 - 2(3^2 - 3 + 1) = 0$, we do not draw any dummy agent in Fig. 1.

When $n = 14$, the valuations are shown in details in Table 2. When n is general, the valuations are defined as follows.

- For each super agent s_i , (s)he has value $\frac{1}{k}$ for each item in \mathcal{C}_i and value 0 for each other items. In the example of $n = 14$, as shown in Table 2, super agent s_1 only has a positive value to items in \mathcal{C}_1 .
- For each $j = 1, \dots, t$ and each of the two normal agents $a_{(u,v)}^{(j)}$ and $a_{(v,u)}^{(j)}$ in group j , they both have value x to the clique items $c_u^{(j)}$ and $c_v^{(j)}$. Moreover, they both have value e_w to the partition item $p_w^{(j), \{u,v\}}$ for each $w = 1, \dots, \ell$ and value 0 to the partition items in other groups. Other than these items, for each normal agent, (s)he has value $x - \varepsilon$ to each pool item. As shown in Table 1, those normal agents have the same value $x - \varepsilon$ to those pool items q_1, \dots, q_{12} .
- For each dummy agent, (s)he values $\frac{1}{n - t(k^2 - k + 1)}$ to all dummy items(if existing).

If the partition instance is a yes-instance, consider the following allocation. For each $j = 1, \dots, t$, we allocate super agent s_j all the k clique items in group \mathcal{C}_j . For each normal agent, we allocate her one pool item with value $x - \varepsilon$ and a set of partition items with total value ε (the partition instance is a yes-instance). Each dummy agent receives exactly one dummy item. Hence, each normal agent receives value x in total. It is not hard to verify that this allocation is EF1. In particular, a normal agent will not strongly envy the super agent in the same group because, according to her utility function, the super agent receives two items with value x and all the other items have value 0. In this allocation, the social welfare is given by

$$SW(\mathcal{A}) \geq \underbrace{t \times 1}_{\text{clique items}} + \underbrace{t(k^2 - k) \times (x - \varepsilon)}_{\text{pool items}} + \underbrace{t(k^2 - k) \times \varepsilon}_{\text{partition items}} = t + t(k^2 - k)x.$$

If the partition instance is a no-instance, we will show an upper bound on the social welfare. For each $j = 1, \dots, k$, we first argue that super agent s_j can take at most $\sqrt{2tk} + 1$ items in \mathcal{C}_j . Suppose s_j takes s items in \mathcal{C}_j . Since each item correspond to an unique vertex and there are $\frac{s^2 - s}{2}$ edges in the clique induced by the s vertices, then there are $s^2 - s$ normal agents in group j who can not receive any value from \mathcal{C}_j . Since the partition instance is a no-instance, half of these normal agents can only receive less than ε value from the partition items. To ensure they do not strongly envy s_j , each of them should take at least two pool items. Since at least $\frac{s^2 - s}{2}$ agents need to take at least two pool items and the number of the pool items equals to the number of the normal agents, at least $\frac{s^2 - s}{2}$ normal agents can not take any pool item. To ensure they do not strongly envy other agents, they need to take at least one clique item. Hence, $\frac{s^2 - s}{2} \leq tk$, which implies $(s - 1)^2 \leq 2tk$, which further implies $s \leq \sqrt{2tk} + 1$ as we claimed at the beginning of this paragraph.

Table 2: The valuations of the construction when $n = 14$.

	$c_1^{(1)}$	$c_2^{(1)}$	$c_3^{(1)}$	$c_1^{(2)}$	$c_2^{(2)}$	$c_3^{(2)}$	$p_i^{(1),\{1,2\}}$ ($1 \leq i \leq \ell$)	$p_i^{(1),\{1,3\}}$ ($1 \leq i \leq \ell$)	$p_i^{(1),\{2,3\}}$ ($1 \leq i \leq \ell$)	$p_i^{(2),\{1,2\}}$ ($1 \leq i \leq \ell$)	$p_i^{(2),\{1,3\}}$ ($1 \leq i \leq \ell$)	$p_i^{(2),\{2,3\}}$ ($1 \leq i \leq \ell$)	q_1, \dots, q_{12}
s_1	1/3	1/3	1/3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
s_2	0	0	0	1/3	1/3	1/3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$a_{(1,2)}^{(1)}$	x	x	0	0	0	0	e_i	0	0	0	0	0	$x - \varepsilon$
$a_{(2,1)}^{(1)}$	x	x	0	0	0	0	e_i	0	0	0	0	0	$x - \varepsilon$
$a_{(1,3)}^{(1)}$	x	0	x	0	0	0	0	e_i	0	0	0	0	$x - \varepsilon$
$a_{(3,1)}^{(1)}$	x	0	x	0	0	0	0	e_i	0	0	0	0	$x - \varepsilon$
$a_{(2,3)}^{(1)}$	0	x	x	0	0	0	0	0	e_i	0	0	0	$x - \varepsilon$
$a_{(3,2)}^{(1)}$	0	x	x	0	0	0	0	0	e_i	0	0	0	$x - \varepsilon$
$a_{(1,2)}^{(2)}$	0	0	0	x	x	0	0	0	0	e_i	0	0	$x - \varepsilon$
$a_{(2,1)}^{(2)}$	0	0	0	x	x	0	0	0	0	e_i	0	0	$x - \varepsilon$
$a_{(1,3)}^{(2)}$	0	0	0	x	0	x	0	0	0	0	e_i	0	$x - \varepsilon$
$a_{(3,1)}^{(2)}$	0	0	0	x	0	x	0	0	0	0	e_i	0	$x - \varepsilon$
$a_{(2,3)}^{(2)}$	0	0	0	0	x	x	0	0	0	0	0	e_i	$x - \varepsilon$
$a_{(3,2)}^{(2)}$	0	0	0	0	x	x	0	0	0	0	0	e_i	$x - \varepsilon$

★ Note that $p_i^{(j),\{u,v\}}$ and $p_i^{(j),\{v,u\}}$ are regarded as the same item.

★ Since $n - t(k^2 - k + 1) = 14 - 2(3^2 - 3 + 1) = 0$, there exists no dummy agents and dummy items in this example.

The upper bound of the social welfare is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
SW(\mathcal{A}) &< \underbrace{ts \cdot (1/k) + tk \cdot x}_{\text{clique items}} + \underbrace{t(k^2 - k) \cdot (x - \varepsilon)}_{\text{pool items}} + \underbrace{t(k^2 - k) \cdot \varepsilon}_{\text{partition items}} + \\
&\quad + \underbrace{(n - t(k^2 - k + 1)) \frac{1}{n - t(k^2 - k + 1)}}_{\text{dummy items}} \\
&= \frac{ts}{k} + tkx + tx(k^2 - k) + 1 \\
&\leq \frac{ts}{k} + 1 + 1 + 1 \quad (x \text{ is defined as } \frac{1 + (t(k^2 - k) - 2)\varepsilon}{t(k^2 - k) + 2}, \text{ and } \varepsilon \text{ is small}) \\
&= \frac{ts}{k} + 3
\end{aligned}$$

For the last inequality, it is straightforward to verify $tkx \leq 1$ and $tx(k^2 - k) \leq 1$ by definitions of t , k and x . Finally, the inapproximability factor is no less than

$$\frac{t + t(k^2 - k)x}{\frac{ts}{k} + 3} \geq \frac{t}{\frac{ts}{k} + 3} = \frac{1}{\frac{s}{k} + \frac{3}{t}} \geq \frac{1}{\frac{\sqrt{2tk+1}}{k} + \frac{3}{t}} \geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\frac{t}{k}} + \frac{3}{n^{\frac{1}{7}}}}.$$

We can notice that:

$$\frac{t}{k} = \frac{t}{\left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{4n}{t}} - 3 \right\rfloor} \leq \frac{t}{\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{4n}{t}} - 3 \right)} \leq \frac{t}{\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{n}{t}}} = \frac{2t^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{2(2n^{\frac{1}{7}})^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{4\sqrt{2}}{n^{\frac{2}{7}}},$$

where the middle inequality can be obtained by straightforward computations and the fact that $\sqrt{n/t} \geq 1$.

Therefore, the inapproximability is at least:

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\frac{t}{k}} + \frac{3}{n^{\frac{1}{7}}}} \geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{4\sqrt{2}\frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{7}}} + \frac{3}{n^{\frac{1}{7}}}}} \geq \frac{1}{\frac{7}{n^{\frac{1}{7}}} + \frac{3}{n^{\frac{1}{7}}}} = \frac{n^{\frac{1}{7}}}{10},$$

so the theorem concludes. \square

For unnormalized valuations, we have the following result which states that MSW_{WITHINEF1} admits a $\Theta(1/\sqrt{n})$ inapproximability factor as n grows (while still being a constant).

Theorem 4.7. *For any fixed constant $n \geq 2$, MSW_{WITHINEF1} is NP-hard to approximate to within any factor that is larger than $1/\lfloor \frac{1+\sqrt{4n-3}}{2} \rfloor$.*

5 Maximizing Social Welfare for General Number of Agents

In this section, we will see that MSW_{WITHINEF1} becomes largely inapproximable for general number of agents (that is not a constant), and the inapproximability still holds even if we relax EF1 to ε -approximate EF1 for any positive $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

The following theorem shows that MSW_{WITHINEF1} is NP-hard to approximate within a factor polynomial in n or m , when the number of agents n is given as an input.

Theorem 5.1. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, MSW_{WITHINEF1} is NP-hard to approximate $SW(\mathcal{A})$ to within a factor of $1/n^{\frac{1}{3}-\varepsilon}$, or within a factor of $1/m^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}$, even with normalized valuations.*

Proof. We will present a reduction from the maximum independent set problem. We begin by describing the construction, which will be used for proving *both* theorems.

The construction. Fix a maximum independent set instance $G = (V, E)$, and let $k = |V|$ and $\ell = |E|$. We will construct a fair division instance with $n = k\ell + k$ agents and $m = 2k^2$ items. We will assume $\ell > 2k$ (notice that we can add multi-edges without changing the nature of the independent set problem).

The agents are partitioned into k groups. Agents are named by $\{a_1^{(j)}, \dots, a_\ell^{(j)}, s^{(j)}\}_{j=1, \dots, k}$. Group j consists of $\ell + 1$ agents $a_1^{(j)}, \dots, a_\ell^{(j)}, s^{(j)}$. Each edge $e_i \in E$ in the maximum independent set instance corresponds to k agents $a_i^{(1)}, \dots, a_i^{(k)}$. In particular, for each group j , the ℓ agents $a_1^{(j)}, \dots, a_\ell^{(j)}$ represent the ℓ edges in G , and there is a special agent $s^{(j)}$. We will use $A^{(j)}$ to denote the set of agents in group j .

The items are partitioned into $k + 1$ groups defined as follows. For each $j = 1, \dots, k$, group j contains k items $b_1^{(j)}, \dots, b_k^{(j)}$. Each vertex $u_i \in V$ in the maximum independent set instance corresponds to k items $b_i^{(1)}, \dots, b_i^{(k)}$. The $(k + 1)$ -th group contains k^2 items c_1, \dots, c_{k^2} . We will use $B^{(j)}$ to denote the set of items in group j for each $j = 1, \dots, k$ and C to denote the set of items in group $k + 1$.

The valuations are defined as follows. For each special agent $s^{(j)}$, (s)he has value $1/k$ for each item in $B^{(j)}$, and value 0 for each of the remaining items. For each agent $a_i^{(j)}$, (s)he has value $\tau/2$ for each of the two items $b_{i_1}^{(j)}$ and $b_{i_2}^{(j)}$ representing the two vertices u_{i_1} and u_{i_2} of the edge e_i , (s)he has value $(1 - \tau)/k^2$ for each item in C , and (s)he has value 0 for each of the remaining items, where we set $\tau = 2/k^2$ so that item $b_{i_1}^{(j)}$ and $b_{i_2}^{(j)}$ have a slightly higher value than each item in C .

Proof sketch. Notice that, for each $j = 1, \dots, k$, the agent group $A^{(j)} \setminus \{s^{(j)}\}$ and the item group $B^{(j)}$ resembles the graph $G = (V, E)$ in that each edge is represented by exactly one agent in $A^{(j)} \setminus \{s^{(j)}\}$ and each vertex is represented by exactly one item in $B^{(j)}$. The k groups can be viewed as k copies of the maximum independent set instance.

For each group j , the items in $B^{(j)}$ have much higher values to agent $s^{(j)}$ than to any other agents. We need to maximize the number of the items in $B^{(j)}$ that are allocated to $s^{(j)}$.

On the other hand, the number of the “non-special” agents, $k\ell$, is more than the number of items $2k^2$. This implies some non-special agents will receive no item at all. Since all the non-special agents have a common valuation on items in C , to guarantee EF1, no agent can receive more than one item in C .

It is then easy to see that, in each group j , the items allocated to agent $s^{(j)}$ must correspond to an independent set in G . For otherwise, if $s^{(j)}$ receives both items $b_{i_1}^{(j)}$ and $b_{i_2}^{(j)}$ for an edge $e_i = (u_{i_1}, u_{i_2})$, agent $a_i^{(j)}$ will have to receive at least two items in C to guarantee EF1 (recall that, for agent $a_i^{(j)}$, the value of $b_{i_1}^{(j)}$ or $b_{i_2}^{(j)}$ is higher than the value of any item in C), and we have seen that this is infeasible.

Since we would like to maximize the number of items in $B^{(j)}$ that are allocated to agent $s^{(j)}$, our problem now naturally becomes the problem of maximizing the size of the independent set in G . Notice that the k groups simulate the k identical copies of the maximum independent set instance.

Since $\ell = O(k^2)$, we have $n = O(k^3)$ and $m = \Theta(k^2)$. Theorem 5.1 holds due to Theorem 5.5.

Formal proof. For the completeness part, we prove the following proposition.

Proposition 5.2. *If G has an independent set of size t , then there exists an allocation with social welfare at least t .*

Proof. Let $I \subseteq V$ be an independent set of G with $|I| = t$. Consider the following allocation. For each $j = 1, \dots, k$, allocate $\{b_i^{(j)} \mid u_i \in I\}$ to agent $s^{(j)}$. Allocate remaining items arbitrarily subject to that each remaining agent in $\{A^{(j)} \setminus \{s^{(j)}\} \mid j = 1, \dots, k\}$ receive at most one item.

It is straightforward to see that the allocation is EF1. Since each agent in $\{A^{(j)} \setminus \{s^{(j)}\} \mid j = 1, \dots, k\}$ receives at most one item, no agent will strongly envy any of them. It remains to show that no one will envy $s^{(j)}$ for each j . Firstly, those special agents $\{s^{(j)}\}$ will not envy each other. This is because each $s^{(j)}$ receives items from group $B^{(j)}$ only, and (s)he only has positive values for items in $B^{(j)}$. Secondly, each non-special agent $a_i^{(j')}$ will not envy each special agent $s^{(j)}$. If $j \neq j'$, agent $a_i^{(j')}$ has 0 value for every item in $B^{(j)}$, and thus will not envy $s^{(j)}$. If $j = j'$, the only two items in $B^{(j)}$ that agent $a_i^{(j')}$ has non-zero values are $b_{i_1}^{(j)}$ and $b_{i_2}^{(j)}$, where $e_i = (u_{i_1}, u_{i_2})$ is the edge corresponding to $a_i^{(j')}$. Since $s^{(j)}$ receives items that correspond to an independent set, $s^{(j)}$ receives at most one of $b_{i_1}^{(j)}$ and $b_{i_2}^{(j)}$. Thus, agent $a_i^{(j')}$ does not envy $s^{(j)}$.

Finally, we find a lower bound on the social welfare by only consider special agents. Each $s^{(j)}$ receives t items, and each of them has value $1/k$. Since there are k special agents, the social welfare is at least $k \cdot t \cdot \frac{1}{k} = t$. \square

For the soundness part, we prove the following proposition.

Proposition 5.3. *If G does not have an independent set of size larger than t , then the social welfare of any allocation is at most $t + 2$.*

Proof. Consider an arbitrarily allocation \mathcal{A} . The crucial observation is that $A_{s^{(j)}} \cap B^{(j)}$ must correspond to an independent set. To see this, suppose for an edge $e_i = (u_{i_1}, u_{i_2})$ some agent $s^{(j)}$ receives both items $b_{i_1}^{(j)}$ and $b_{i_2}^{(j)}$. Recall that agent $a_i^{(j)}$ has value $\tau/2 = 1/k^2$ on each of both items, and (s)he has value $(1 - \tau)/k^2$ on each item in C which is less than $1/k^2$. To guarantee EF1, agent $a_i^{(j)}$ must receive at least two items in C . To guarantee each remaining non-special agent does not envy agent $a_i^{(j)}$, each non-special agent should receive at least one item. The total number of non-special agents is $k\ell$, which is more than the total number of items $2k^2$. Thus, EF1 cannot be guaranteed if $A_{s^{(j)}} \cap B^{(j)}$ does not correspond to an independent set.

With this observation and the assumption that the maximum independent set has size no more than t , each special agent $s^{(j)}$ receives a bundle with value at most t/k . Thus, the overall utility for all the special agents is at most t . For the non-special agent, each item is worth at most $\tau/2 = 1/k^2$. Even if all the $2k^2$ items are allocated to the non-special agents, the overall utility for all the non-special agents is bounded by $2k^2 \cdot \frac{1}{k^2} = 2$. Therefore, the social welfare of \mathcal{A} is at most $t + 2$. \square

To conclude the proof, Theorem 5.5 and the two propositions above imply it is NP-hard to approximate $SW(\mathcal{A})$ to within a factor of $k^{1-\epsilon}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. Since $m = 2k^2$, the inapproximability factor can be written as $\frac{1}{(\sqrt{2})^{1-\epsilon}} m^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon}$, which is more than $m^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}$ by choosing ϵ appropriately. This concludes Theorem 5.1 for the part with m . Since $\ell = O(k^2)$, we have $n = O(k^3)$. We can see Theorem 5.1 for the part with n holds by rewriting $k^{1-\epsilon}$ in a similar way. \square

For a constant number of agents, we show in Section 4.1 that MSWWITHINEF1 becomes tractable if we slightly relax EF1. However, the following theorem shows that MSWWITHINEF1 admits polynomial inapproximability factors even if EF1 is largely relaxed.

Theorem 5.4. *For any small $\epsilon > 0$, if there exists an algorithm that computes an allocation \mathcal{A} such that \mathcal{A} is ϵ -approximate EF1 and $SW(\mathcal{A}) \geq \frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}} SW(\mathcal{A}^*)$, then $P = NP$, where \mathcal{A}^* is an EF1 allocation that maximizes social welfare. With respect to the number of items, the result also holds if $\frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}}$ is replaced by $\frac{1}{m^{1-\epsilon}}$.*

Proof. The proofs for both theorems are similar to the proof in Appendix A.2 in the paper [Barman et al., 2019]. We present a reduction from the maximum independent set problem.

Given a maximum independent set instance $G = (V, E)$, we construct a fair division instances with n items and $m + 1$ agents, where $n = |V|$ and $m = |E|$. Those n items correspond to the n vertices in G . Those $m + 1$ agents consist of a *super agent* and m *edge agents* that correspond to the m edges in G .

Fix a small number $\delta > 0$. The super agent has value 1 for each item. For the edge agent representing the edge (u, v) , (s)he has value δ on the two items representing u and v , and (s)he has value 0 on the remaining items.

To guarantee ϵ -approximate EF1, it is required that the super agent cannot take any pair of items representing vertices u and v for an edge (u, v) . For otherwise, the agent representing the edge (u, v) will receive a value of 0, and ϵ -approximate EF1 fails to hold for any $\epsilon > 0$. As a result, the set of items taken by the super agent must correspond to an independent set in G .

By making δ sufficiently small, the social welfare almost exclusively depends on the super agent's utility. Theorem 5.4 follows easily from Theorem 5.5 and the fact $m = O(n^2)$. \square

It needs to mention that the proofs for the above two theorems make use of the $n^{1-\varepsilon}$ inapproximability result of the maximum independent set problem due to Håstad [1996], Khot [2001], Zuckerman [2006].¹

Theorem 5.5 (Inapproximability of Maximum Independent Set). *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, it is NP-hard to approximate the maximum independent set problem to within a factor of $n^{1-\varepsilon}$.*

Finally, we remark that a simple variant of the round-robin algorithm can achieve the following result:

Theorem 5.6. *There exists an $\frac{1}{n}$ -approximation algorithm for MSWWITHINEF1.*

Proof. We present a variant of the round-robin algorithm. Like the round-robin algorithm, our algorithm consists of $\lceil m/n \rceil$ iterations. In each iteration except for the last iteration, exactly n items are allocated such that each agent receive exactly one item. In each iteration, we first find a tuple (i, g) with maximum $v_i(g)$ such that agent i has not been allocated an item yet in the current iteration and item g has not been allocated, and we allocate item g to agent i . We do this n times until each agent receives exactly one item in this iteration.

Firstly, the allocation output by our algorithm is EF1, for the same reason that standard round-robin algorithm is EF1. The crucial observation here is that, for every agent, the item (s)he receives at a particular iteration has a (weakly) larger value than the value of any item that is allocated in the later iterations. Therefore, for any pair of agents i and j , in agent i 's valuation, the item allocated to agent i at the t -th iteration has a (weakly) larger value than the item allocated to agent j at the $(t + 1)$ -th iteration. Thus, if removing the item allocated to agent j in the first iteration from agent j 's bundle, agent i will not envy agent j .

We will then show that this is a $\frac{1}{n}$ -approximation algorithm for MSWWITHINEF1. Let I_t be the set of items allocated in the t -th iterations. For each item g , let $u_g^* = \max_{i=1, \dots, n} v_i(g)$. It is obvious that

$$\sum_{g=1}^m u_g^* = \sum_{t=1}^{\lceil m/n \rceil} \sum_{g \in I_t} u_g^*$$

is an upper bound to the optimal social welfare. On the other hand, let $o_t \in I_t$ be the first item allocated in the t -th iteration, and let a_t be the agent who receives o_t . By the nature of our algorithm, we have $v_{a_t}(o_t) = u_{o_t}^* \geq u_g^*$ for any $g \in I_t$. By only accounting for the items $o_1, \dots, o_{\lceil m/n \rceil}$, the social welfare for the allocation \mathcal{A} output by our algorithm satisfies

$$SW(\mathcal{A}) \geq \sum_{t=1}^{\lceil m/n \rceil} u_{o_t}^* \geq \sum_{t=1}^{\lceil m/n \rceil} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{g \in I_t} u_g^* \right) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=1}^m u_g^*,$$

which shows that our algorithm is a $\frac{1}{n}$ -approximation algorithm for MSWWITHINEF1. □

6 Conclusion and Future Work

In this work, we provided a complete landscape on the complexity and approximability of maximizing social welfare subject to the EF1 constraint. For two agents, we completed the approximability gap by presenting an FPTAS and an NP-hardness result. For a constant number of agents, we showed that the problem is basically inapproximable by proving that the inapproximability factor increases with a polynomial speed as n increases. However, we demonstrated the strong tractability of this problem if we slightly relax EF1 by a factor that can be arbitrarily close to 1. For general number of agents, we showed that the problem is intractable even with EF1 being relaxed by an arbitrary factor.

Given that this problem has been well understood for the cake cutting problem and is now well understood for the indivisible item allocation problem, an interesting future direction is to study this problem for the

¹Håstad [1996] showed the inapproximability for the ratio $n^{1-\varepsilon}$ under the stronger assumption $ZPP \neq NP$. Khot [2001] described more precisely the inapproximability ratio, but with an even stronger assumption. Zuckerman [2006] derandomized the construction weakening its assumption to $P \neq NP$.

mixed divisible and indivisible goods. The allocation of mixed goods was first considered by Bei et al. [2021a] in which a fairness notion “EFM” that adapts EF is proposed. Studying maximizing the efficiency while guaranteeing fairness is thus a compelling future direction.

References

- Atila Abdulkadiroğlu, Parag A Pathak, and Alvin E Roth. The new york city high school match. *American Economic Review*, 95(2):364–367, 2005.
- Yonatan Aumann and Yair Dombb. The efficiency of fair division with connected pieces. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation (TEAC)*, 3(4):1–16, 2015.
- Yonatan Aumann, Yair Dombb, and Avinatan Hassidim. Computing socially-efficient cake divisions. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems (AAMAS)*, 2013.
- Haris Aziz, Xin Huang, Nicholas Mattei, and Erel Segal-Halevi. Computing welfare-maximizing fair allocations of indivisible goods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.03979*, 2020.
- Siddharth Barman, Sanath Kumar Krishnamurthy, and Rohit Vaish. Finding fair and efficient allocations. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, page 557–574, 2018.
- Siddharth Barman, Ganesh Ghalme, Shweta Jain, Pooja Kulkarni, and Shivika Narang. Fair division of indivisible goods among strategic agents. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems (AAMAS)*, page 1811–1813, 2019.
- Siddharth Barman, Umang Bhaskar, and Nisarg Shah. Optimal bounds on the price of fairness for indivisible goods. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Web and Internet Economics (WINE)*, page 356–369, 2020.
- Xiaohui Bei, Ning Chen, Xia Hua, Biaoshuai Tao, and Endong Yang. Optimal proportional cake cutting with connected pieces. In *Proceedings of AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, pages 1263–1269, 2012.
- Xiaohui Bei, Zihao Li, Jinyan Liu, Shengxin Liu, and Xinhang Lu. Fair division of mixed divisible and indivisible goods. *Artificial Intelligence*, 293:103436, 2021a.
- Xiaohui Bei, Xinhang Lu, Pasin Manurangsi, and Warut Suksompong. The price of fairness for indivisible goods. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 65(7):1069–1093, 2021b.
- Steven Brams, Michal Feldman, John Lai, Jamie Morgenstern, and Ariel Procaccia. On maxsum fair cake divisions. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, volume 26, pages 1285–1291, 2012.
- Steven J. Brams and Alan D. Taylor. *Fair Division: From Cake-Cutting to Dispute Resolution*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Felix Brandt, Vincent Conitzer, Ulle Endriss, Jérôme Lang, and Ariel D. Procaccia, editors. *Handbook of Computational Social Choice*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Eric Budish. The combinatorial assignment problem: Approximate competitive equilibrium from equal incomes. *Journal of Political Economy*, 119(6):1061–1103, 2011.
- Eric Budish and Estelle Cantillon. The multi-unit assignment problem: Theory and evidence from course allocation at harvard. *American Economic Review*, 102(5):2237–71, 2012.
- Ioannis Caragiannis, Christos Kaklamanis, Panagiotis Kanellopoulos, and Maria Kyropoulou. The efficiency of fair division. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 50(4):589–610, 2012.

- Ioannis Caragiannis, David Kurokawa, Hervé Moulin, Ariel D. Procaccia, Nisarg Shah, and Junxing Wang. The unreasonable fairness of maximum nash welfare. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, page 305–322, 2016.
- Yuga J Kohler, John K Lai, David C Parkes, and Ariel D Procaccia. Optimal envy-free cake cutting. In *Proceedings of AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, pages 626–631, 2011.
- Vincent Conitzer, Rupert Freeman, and Nisarg Shah. Fair public decision making. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, page 629–646, 2017.
- Ulle Endriss, editor. *Trends in Computational Social Choice*. AI Access, 2017.
- Rupert Freeman, Sujoy Sikdar, Rohit Vaish, and Lirong Xia. Equitable allocations of indivisible goods. In *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, page 280–286, 2019.
- Ali Ghodsi, Matei Zaharia, Benjamin Hindman, Andy Konwinski, Scott Shenker, and Ion Stoica. Dominant resource fairness: Fair allocation of multiple resource types. In *Proceedings of USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI)*, 2011.
- Laurent Gourvès, Jérôme Monnot, and Lydia Tlilane. Near fairness in matroids. In *Proceedings of European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI)*, pages 393–398, 2014.
- Johan Håstad. Clique is hard to approximate within $n^{1-\epsilon}$. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 627–636, 1996.
- Subhash Khot. Improved inapproximability results for maxclique, chromatic number and approximate graph coloring. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 600–609, 2001.
- Jing Wu Lian, Nicholas Mattei, Renee Noble, and Toby Walsh. The conference paper assignment problem: Using order weighted averages to assign indivisible goods. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, pages 1138–1145, 2018.
- Richard Lipton, Evangelos Markakis, Elchanan Mossel, and Amin Saberi. On approximately fair allocations of indivisible goods. In *ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce (EC)*, pages 125–131, 2004.
- Hervé Moulin. Fair division in the internet age. *Annual Review of Economics*, 11(1):407–441, 2019.
- Aniket Murhekar and Jugal Garg. On fair and efficient allocations of indivisible goods. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, pages 5595–5602, 2021.
- Erel Segal-Halevi and Balázs R. Sziklai. Monotonicity and competitive equilibrium in cake-cutting. *Economic Theory*, 68(2):363–401, 2019.
- Vijay V Vazirani. *Approximation algorithms*, volume 1. Springer, 2001.
- David Zuckerman. Linear degree extractors and the inapproximability of max clique and chromatic number. In *Proceedings of the annual ACM Symposium on Theory of computing (STOC)*, pages 681–690, 2006.